

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1897.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. HUGH JOHNSTON, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Woman's Health Protective Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying the President of the United States and the Senate to formulate such treaties as will effectually prevent the difficulties arising between the United States and other nations; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the J. Miller Company, of Racine, Wis., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on tanned skins for morocco or a duty on raw goatskins; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of A. D. Fleming & Co., flax spinners and bleachers, of Albany, Wis., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on imported flax tow; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Menasha Wooden Ware Company, of Menasha, Wis., remonstrating against a change in the present law governing the use of wooden tobacco pails; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of the Howard Furniture Company, of Nashua; of Foster & Pinkham, of Henniker; of Blake, Allen & Co., of Manchester, and of Crafts & Green, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against any increase in the present rate of duty on tanned skins for morocco or a duty on raw goatskins; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEBOE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Carrollton and Catlettsburg, in the State of Kentucky, praying for the passage, at the earliest possible date, of such protective-tariff legislation as will adequately secure American industrial products against the competition of foreign labor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Rev. F. T. Heffernan, superintendent of the Louisville (Ky.) Church Workers and sundry other citizens of Kentucky, praying for the repeal of the present civil-service law; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City and a petition of sundry citizens of Sodas Point, N. Y., praying for the early enactment of a protective-tariff law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York City engaged in the lumber business, remonstrating against the proposed duty of \$2 per thousand feet on lumber; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry memorials of citizens of New York City and sundry memorials of citizens of Norwich, Conn., remonstrating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BATE. I present, by request, a petition of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Tenn., praying for the passage, at the earliest possible date, of such protective-tariff legislation as will adequately secure American industrial products against the competition of foreign labor. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER presented a memorial of members of the North Carolina Liquor Dealers, Distillers, and Grape Growers' Association, remonstrating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a memorial of the North Carolina Liquor Dealers, Distillers, and Grape Growers' Association, remonstrating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Concord, N. C., and a petition of sundry citizens of Greensboro, N. C., praying for the early passage of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Grocers and Exporters' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Sixth Ward Republican Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the present civil-service law; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lancaster, Pa., and a memorial of sundry brewers of Lancaster, Pa., remon-

strating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 17 citizens of Philadelphia, of 53 citizens of Philadelphia, of 37 citizens of Norristown, 46 citizens of McKean, 26 citizens of Allegheny County, 52 citizens of Pennsylvania, 100 citizens of Philadelphia, 77 citizens of Weissport, and of Steelton Circle, No. 26, of Steelton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation restricting immigration; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 31 citizens of Minersville, of 47 citizens of Philadelphia, of 43 citizens of Philadelphia, 24 citizens of Steelton, 24 citizens of Wilkesbarre, 34 citizens of Reading, 30 citizens of Philadelphia, 13 citizens of Philadelphia, 36 citizens of Reading, 46 citizens of Philadelphia, of 9 citizens of Philadelphia, and of the select and common councils of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the early passage of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Merchant Tailors' Exchange of Allegheny, Pa., and a petition of Local Union No. 131, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the adoption of clause 666 in the pending tariff bill, limiting the free importation of wearing apparel, etc.; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the general assembly of Pennsylvania, praying for the early passage of Senate bill No. 1747, reappointing and retiring Gen. David McMurtree Gregg, late captain, Sixth United States Cavalry, and brevet major-general of United States Volunteers, with the rank and grade of captain; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MILLS presented a memorial of Brewers' Union No. 112, of San Antonio, Tex., remonstrating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a memorial of the C. A. Hibbard Boot and Shoe Company, remonstrating against any increase in the present rate of duty on tanned skins for morocco, or a duty on raw goatskins; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of Emil Wulschuer & Son, of New York City, praying that the duty on musical instruments and parts for the same be provided for at the rate of 35 per cent ad valorem; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HANNA presented memorials of D. H. Gaumer and 19 other citizens, of E. W. Van Wagenen and 19 other citizens, of W. T. Cosgrove and 19 other citizens, of S. A. Weller and 51 other citizens, C. N. Ritter and 19 other citizens, S. McCarthy and 16 other citizens, Leo Guthman and 19 other citizens, Otto A. Bauer and 19 other citizens, William H. Smith and 19 other citizens, the Sexton Furniture Company and 14 citizens, I. W. Clark and 18 other citizens, A. Parsons and 45 other citizens, J. T. Crabbs and 52 other citizens, J. C. Fish and 51 other citizens, J. S. Marquis and 50 other citizens, W. J. Tappan and 51 other citizens, G. S. Brum and 52 other citizens, Allen Thompson and 49 other citizens, Dr. J. A. Francis, jr., and 18 other citizens, W. L. Rowland and 49 other citizens, J. C. Fish and 52 other citizens, Harry L. Peebles and 16 other citizens, A. S. Clark and 19 other citizens, and of J. A. Knapp and 27 other citizens, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FORAKER presented memorials of the Bailey Drug Company and 18 citizens, the Collier-Budd Coal Company and 11 citizens, of James Shiny and 19 other citizens, J. B. Olivers and 49 other citizens, E. W. Hunting and 18 other citizens, Edward G. Howard and 52 other citizens, J. H. Wilson and 19 other citizens, Edward L. Meyers and 14 other citizens, and of William F. Gabell and 17 other citizens, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS presented memorials of C. C. Snedeker and 53 other citizens, Wright, Kay & Co. and 39 other citizens, David Long and 49 other citizens, Charles A. Strelinger and 45 other citizens, H. C. Hubbin and 19 other citizens, and of Brown Bros. and 51 other citizens, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I desire to present a large number of memorials which have been sent to me to be presented to the Senate, and I will ask the Secretary to note the name of the first memorialist on each paper and the number of signers. I should say that I have been informed, and from my examination believe it to be true, that these memorials are signed by some 15,000 memorialists. I am also informed that most of them are citizens of the State of Illinois. They protest against the passage of the anti-scalping bill. I should like to have the RECORD show the names, not of all the memorialists, but the first name on each memorial, and the number that follow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

The memorials are as follows:

Memorials of G. C. Burk and 49 other citizens, of Tower Dawson & Co. and 52 other citizens, of A. J. Shilling and 52 other citizens, of H. Lau and 51 other citizens, of E. D. Read and 50 other citizens, James D. Murphy and 50 other citizens, A. J. Reynolds and 40 other citizens, J. R. Black and 52 other citizens, A. R. Stanley and 52 other citizens, G. E. Ranaous and 19 other citizens, F. Wiehle and 26 other citizens, O. F. Bridges and 19 other citizens, J. F. Neuman and 52 other citizens, J. C. Hagenbuch and 17 other citizens, H. M. Shoub and 19 other citizens, J. H. Johnson and 18 other citizens, D. H. Clarke and 19 other citizens, D. Ogdine and 19 other citizens, H. Barkhausen and 19 other citizens, W. B. Senmark and 50 other citizens, H. Cooting and 52 other citizens, Robert Manning and 51 other citizens, Thomas Drury and 52 other citizens, L. C. Noble and 49 other citizens, M. L. Brown and 52 other citizens, S. Rice and 49 other citizens, J. Conarty and 52 other citizens, E. Wilken and 52 other citizens, D. P. Shaw and 50 other citizens, D. J. Riley and 52 other citizens, J. J. Conerty and 52 other citizens, Harry Filkins and 51 other citizens, J. J. Sullivan and 30 other citizens, H. Bottheim and 52 other citizens, Charles Nebel and 49 other citizens, A. R. Schroeder and 51 other citizens, C. J. Roe and 51 other citizens, T. McArdle and 52 other citizens, W. W. Taylor and 52 other citizens, P. H. Wilson and 52 other citizens, H. Y. Whiteman and 52 other citizens, W. G. Hargis and 52 other citizens, Charles Stornan and 51 other citizens, L. C. Noble and 48 other citizens, W. A. Sager and 41 other citizens, N. O'Brien and 43 other citizens, S. Wilson and 52 other citizens, J. P. Warner and 51 other citizens, F. J. Thompson and 19 other citizens, Filis Perl and 52 other citizens, Arnold Schiess and 52 other citizens, George W. Nye and 52 other citizens, F. J. Purdy and 52 other citizens, William McChesney and 49 other citizens, Th. Williams and 52 other citizens, E. J. McCarty and 52 other citizens, M. Plunkett and 52 other citizens, E. P. Adams and 50 other citizens, A. N. Swigert and 52 other citizens, J. A. Keley and 52 other citizens, F. E. Hatfield and 52 other citizens, B. C. Teal and 52 other citizens, M. Timmons and 20 other citizens, George D. Hall, M. D., and 51 other citizens, E. J. Highland and 49 other citizens, J. Hughes and 52 other citizens, W. O. Robertson and 52 other citizens, A. J. Wilson and 52 other citizens, E. Flin and 52 other citizens, R. Hand and 52 other citizens, J. T. Sullivan and 52 other citizens, C. A. Davies and 52 other citizens, J. G. Eager and 51 other citizens, H. Gundling and 52 other citizens, J. C. Duncan and 52 other citizens, L. B. Care and 52 other citizens, P. Lane and 52 other citizens, A. B. Horne and 51 other citizens, S. F. Erskine and 52 other citizens, T. T. Hughes and 52 other citizens, P. J. Holbrook and 52 other citizens, S. Lange and 52 other citizens, P. H. Wilson and 52 other citizens, J. N. Pincier and 51 other citizens, W. H. Bromiley and 52 other citizens, M. Ginby and 52 other citizens, S. Lee and 52 other citizens, W. J. Fagan and 52 other citizens, C. A. Vim Velzu and 52 other citizens, W. J. Tension and 51 other citizens, J. C. Brooks and 52 other citizens, Charles Langguth and 51 other citizens, E. Klosterman and 49 other citizens, N. Parson and 51 other citizens, M. Schellender and 52 other citizens, H. Uebel and 48 other citizens, M. Adler and 52 other citizens, William McChesney and 48 other citizens, A. B. Rosenblum and 52 other citizens, William Force and 52 other citizens, J. Weil & Bros. and 51 other citizens, M. P. Hooker and 49 other citizens, W. J. Salmon and 52 other citizens, W. McDevitt and 52 other citizens, William Johnson and 14 other citizens, Henderson & Jampolis and 46 other citizens, Nelson Chesman and 52 other citizens, E. E. Kelly and 51 other citizens, W. W. David and 52 other citizens, George S. Lemon and 49 other citizens, M. Timmons and 19 other citizens, E. E. Duseman and 11 other citizens, E. R. Blake and 15 other citizens, The Fort Wayne Electric Corporation and 51 citizens, T. P. Blanchard and 52 other citizens, J. Chuseman and 51 other citizens, G. A. Washburn and 52 other citizens, W. H. Wright and 52 other citizens, C. A. Van Velger and 52 other citizens, J. A. Grant and 52 other citizens, E. Wertke and 52 other citizens, J. J. Jones and 50 other citizens, W. Mangler and 52 other citizens, F. L. Clark and 52 other citizens, S. Jones and 52 other citizens, H. C. Nau and 52 other citizens, H. A. Williamson and 51 other citizens, J. Schneider and 52 other citizens, Charles Deubler and 51 other citizens, E. Simon and 51 other citizens, M. Goldsmith and 51 other citizens, D. C. Clark and 52 other citizens, William G. Morrison and 52 other citizens, S. Singer and 57 other citizens, N. H. Daly and 52 other citizens, G. S. Glurehauf and 52 other citizens, J. Ascher and 52 other citizens, J. N. Mason and 50 other citizens, B. Amheim and 52 other citizens, L. Cohn and 17 other citizens, A. Arenson and 52 other citizens, D. Camp and 52 other citizens, A. R. Mitchell and 52 other citizens, E. V. Doran and 52 other citizens, C. Langguth and 52 other citizens, L. C. Marks & Co. and 52 other citizens, J. Valentine and 52 other citizens, P. J. Metty and 49 other citizens, W. Cronan and 52 other citizens, M. Connors and 52 other citizens, G. P. Burke and 49 other citizens, Grossman, Michelson & Co.

and 52 other citizens, J. C. Wagner and 52 other citizens, E. Goldman & Co. and 51 other citizens, S. J. Hirsch and 52 other citizens, J. G. McGregor and 52 other citizens, P. P. Sly and 52 other citizens, E. Selmond and 52 other citizens, D. Heyman and 52 other citizens, Isaac F. Rubel and 52 other citizens, W. Hudson and 52 other citizens, J. Cheesman and 51 other citizens, A. Kennedy and 52 other citizens, Joe Hart and 50 other citizens, John F. Flynn and 29 other citizens, Frank Keene and 51 other citizens, B. J. Daniels and 52 other citizens, D. E. Morton and 52 other citizens, J. G. Jordan and 52 other citizens, George L. Russell and 50 other citizens, Edw. Cummings and 51 other citizens, W. J. Salmon and 52 other citizens, C. J. Leiber and 52 other citizens, the Munwegan & Weiss Manufacturing Company and 52 citizens, D. Kahn & Co. and 52 other citizens, Charles P. Root and 52 other citizens, Thomas B. O'Hara and 52 other citizens, J. Roberts and 52 other citizens, Adolph Moses and 11 other citizens, Henry Stern and 52 other citizens, H. G. Nye and 51 other citizens, Samuel Cains and 51 other citizens, Will. Miller and 52 other citizens, W. W. Wilder and 52 other citizens, J. A. Duggan and 52 other citizens, G. Mendrick and 52 other citizens, G. W. Hambaugh and 52 other citizens, H. S. Rice and 52 other citizens, G. Nuneneger and 49 other citizens, J. H. Brannan and 31 other citizens, F. A. Rogers and 52 other citizens, R. Nixon and 52 other citizens, Charles H. Ames and 23 other citizens, Pettibone, Mulliken & Co. and 49 other citizens, Emil K. Costerman and 49 other citizens, L. S. Kenlay and 52 other citizens, J. N. Mason and 51 other citizens, E. Baird and 52 other citizens, Carl Muller and 52 other citizens, F. M. Goodman and 52 other citizens, James O'Brien and 51 other citizens, Joseph Friedman and 19 other citizens, H. R. Platt and 52 other citizens, E. H. Brown and 52 other citizens, Capt. Jack Cranford and 52 other citizens, S. Adams and 51 other citizens, M. S. Hartman and 50 other citizens, E. J. Hill and 52 other citizens, W. J. Jackson and 52 other citizens, O. E. Pardee and 51 other citizens, M. Gimbel & Sons and 52 other citizens, J. S. Heath and 52 other citizens, E. Hart and 52 other citizens, A. Brown and 36 other citizens, Robert S. Brinton and 52 other citizens, B. Meyer and 52 other citizens, J. S. Horeland and 51 other citizens, the Cole Lithographing Company and 50 citizens, R. M. Atkinson and 52 other citizens, T. S. Rapp and 52 other citizens, James Thompson Drug Manufacturing Company and 52 citizens, S. J. Strickland and 50 other citizens, S. Tanzer and 17 other citizens, E. A. Lufin and 39 other citizens, J. F. Adams and 52 other citizens, T. Jacobs and 49 other citizens, S. Fishel and 51 other citizens, W. Eisendrath and 51 other citizens, J. E. Lamard and 48 other citizens, J. E. Laman and 49 other citizens, W. M. Umbdenstock and 52 other citizens, W. H. Jones and 52 other citizens, W. Eberhardt and 51 other citizens, C. L. Feladamf and 17 other citizens, M. T. Sterling and 52 other citizens, F. Beck and 45 other citizens, G. C. Joseph and 51 other citizens, H. J. Faulkner and 51 other citizens, A. J. Wilson and 52 other citizens, R. S. Turmia and 52 other citizens, H. Ganz and 51 other citizens, H. Y. Whitemon and 52 other citizens, J. C. Salomon and 51 other citizens, M. P. Hooker and 49 other citizens, A. L. Dean & Co. and 52 other citizens, J. McCormick and 52 other citizens, H. C. McDonald and 52 other citizens, C. S. Garrett and 52 other citizens, and J. W. Patterson and 52 other citizens, all in the State of Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. The memorials presented by my colleague should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I did not hear any statement as to their reference.

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorials will be so referred.

Mr. HOAR. I present the memorial of George W. Maddock, president of the Boston Upper Leather Tanners' Club, of Boston, Mass., relative to the tariff on hides and leather. I move that the memorial lie on the table, and that it be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present sundry memorials as to a matter that is immediately pending before one of the committees of this body—sundry memorials of citizens of New Hampshire and other States, remonstrating against the enactment of the antiscapling bill, so called.

The memorialists represent that "the bill would destroy a natural and legal right to dispose of one's own property in the open market." They say "it would enable the strong railroad systems to shut out the weak lines on through business and thus destroy competition," that "it would send a citizen to prison and brand him with infamy for disposing of his own property, while imposing no penalty upon the railroad company for a failure to redeem tickets, as provided," and it also declares that "the business of ticket brokerage is directly in the interest of the traveling public." I ask that the memorials may be separately noted in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The memorials were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Memorials of J. M. Pearion and 19 other citizens, E. C. Eartman and 14 other citizens, G. Sheltry and 9 other citizens, S. Brooks and 18 other citizens, S. Gasper and 17 other citizens, S. C.

Kobler and 50 other citizens, C. P. Kenyon and 18 other citizens, Wright & Lynch and 51 other citizens, H. F. Bancker and 51 other citizens, S. F. Ellis and 50 other citizens, F. A. Milliken and 51 other citizens, Dr. S. Olin Leech and 51 other citizens, George L. Barr and 52 other citizens, H. E. Mitchell and 52 other citizens, Carl Rosenburger and 52 other citizens, and George A. Berry & Co. and 19 other citizens.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the memorial of J. M. Pearson and 58 other citizens of Suncook, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1056) to provide for a public building at Cleveland, Ohio, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2146) granting a pension to Susan Kroeson, widow of Thomas Kroeson, late a soldier in the Union Army during the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ford, late a laundress in Battery F, Second Regiment United States Artillery; and

A bill (S. 2148) for the relief of the legal representatives of Merrick, Merrick & Cope.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2149) for the relief of Richard C. Silence; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

ELECTRIC RAILWAY LINE OVER THE POTOMAC.

Mr. PENROSE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the electric railway line from the Aqueduct Bridge to Fort Myer and Arlington may, with the permission and under the direction of the Secretary of War, be extended across the Aqueduct Bridge on or near the east sidewalk: *Provided*, That all cost of such extension shall be paid by the railway company and that this permission may be revoked by the Secretary of War at any time.

IMPROVEMENT OF CAPE CHARLES HARBOR.

Mr. SEWELL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to prepare and submit plans and estimates for the further improvement of the harbor and approaches at Cape Charles City, Va., by the construction of a stone breakwater on the south side of the cut leading to Cape Charles Harbor, similar to the breakwater which has just been completed on the north side; and for sundry dredging near Old Plantation Light, in the cut leading to the harbor, thereby enabling vessels to go in and out of the harbor without danger or difficulty.

FREDALINE GLASTETTER.

Mr. COCKRELL. On the 16th day of March last I introduced a bill (S. 303) granting a pension to Fredaline Glastetter. He has passed beyond the reach of the beneficence of the Government, and I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from its further consideration, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 379.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States.

The reading of the bill was resumed at page 70, line 25, as follows:

235. Cheese, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.

236. Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was not aware that the bill had been taken up. I was looking at something else. I should be glad to have a moment's delay.

I should like to have an understanding with the Senator from Iowa. There are a considerable number of amendments here where the rates have been raised, as we think, unreasonably, and we would like to have votes upon propositions to reduce them. At the same time we do not want to delay the Senate by taking a vote on every single paragraph. If there were to be no point of order made as to our going back to make the motion, I was thinking that we would perhaps allow a half dozen paragraphs to go at a time, and then move to strike out in each one of the paragraphs the objectionable rate and to substitute what we propose, and have one vote on the whole. I am aware, if we allow a paragraph

to pass, the Senator in charge of the bill can make the point, if he chooses, that the paragraph has gone by and we can not return to it. If that point is to be made, of course we shall have to ask for separate votes as we go along.

Mr. ALLISON. I thoroughly sympathize with the Senator from Arkansas in his desire to make the utmost speed in the consideration of the bill consistent with the care that we ought to take in its examination. Therefore I assure him, upon the suggestion now made by him, that I shall make no point of order.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out paragraph 236, in order to put fresh milk upon the free list, as it is under the existing law. I call attention to the fact that in 1896 we exported \$270,453 worth of milk and imported \$19,100 worth. Here is an article of prime necessity, entirely healthy, necessary to the comfort, indeed, to the life of a large portion of our people. I therefore move to strike out the paragraph in order to put fresh milk upon the free list, where it is now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 236 in the following words:

Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 237, page 71, line 2, after the word "of," to strike out "all coverings and packing material" and insert "immediate coverings;" so as to make the paragraph read:

237. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "2 cents a pound," in line 5, and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the amendment proposed by the committee? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to. The Senator from Arkansas moves an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 5, page 71, it is proposed to strike out "2 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. And also strike out "5 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

The SECRETARY. Also, in lines 5 and 6, strike out "5 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem;" so as to make the paragraph read:

237. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, 20 per cent ad valorem; sugar of milk, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The manufacture of condensed milk was begun just before the war, and has developed rapidly during and since then. There are now about ten factories in the United States that make about 40,000,000 1-pound cans of condensed milk annually. Five of these belong to the New York Condensed Milk Company and two to the Anglo-Swiss Company. Of these seven, four are in New York and three in Illinois.

When the factory employees and the dairy farmers in the vicinity of these establishments learned that McKinley had given the condensed-milk men all the duty they wished on preserved milk and had removed the duty on sugar, which in this particular case the foreigner refused to pay, they were jubilant. Prices of milk and wages were to be greatly advanced. This was the understanding all along the line. Whatever might be the effect of this new tariff act on other industries, it was certain to help the dairy farmer and the workers in the condensed-milk factories. But behold! When the condensed-milk men met and fixed the prices they would pay for milk for the year 1891, instead of being higher, they were found to be lower than for fifteen or twenty years, averaging only 3 cents per quart for winter and 2½ cents for summer months.

The wage earners in this highly protected industry can shake hands with the farmers, for all have been equally benefited by the tariff. Matters are somewhat different with the factory owners, who are now selling condensed milk somewhat higher than in 1890, and are now, because of cheaper sugar, making at least 1 cent more on each pound can, or \$400,000 a year, though they had made their millions under the old duty. Of course, with such a high duty and such enormous profits, it was unbecoming for these men to depend upon the crude and amateurish methods of organization that had before bound them together. They must put their stock in a syndicate and have it sold in the exchanges. Hence, on December 2, 1891, the Associated Press contained the following from Chicago.

A special dispatch from Elgin, Ill., says:

"It is understood that arrangements are completed for the transfer to an English syndicate of the five milk-condensing factories at Carpentersville, Ill., and at Brewster, Wassauc, and Walden, N. Y. They have been owned by the Borden and Milbank families for over twenty-five years. The purchase price is not stated, but as their net revenue last year is said to have been over \$750,000, it must be \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000. The Borden heirs living here and in California are now in New York on this business."

This trust is now in shape to hold fast all the McKinley Act gave it and to dictate wages and prices on everything bought and sold. Moreover, they can and probably will soon begin to give extra discount to foreigners, who now purchase about \$200,000 worth of condensed milk a year from us.

There can be no reason in making this increased tax on this article of prime necessity. The claim that it is done for the purpose of increasing wages of employees is absolutely disproved by the history of this product. The rate that I have proposed by the amendment I have offered is the one under the existing law at this time, under which large quantities of this article are being exported, I understand, and there is practically none being imported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 238, page 71, line 8, after the word "Beans," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

238. Beans, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to allow this paragraph to be passed over.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, the paragraph will be passed over temporarily.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 239, page 71, line 13, after the word "all," to strike out "coverings and packing material" and insert "tins, jars, and other immediate coverings;" so as to make the paragraph read:

239. Beans, pease, and mushrooms, prepared or preserved, in tins, jars, bottles, or similar packages, 24 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem, including the weight of all tins, jars, and other immediate coverings; all vegetables, prepared or preserved, including pickles and sauces of all kinds, not specially provided for in this act, and fish paste or sauce, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

240. Cabbages, 3 cents each.

Mr. VEST. Under the existing law cabbages are upon the free list. I move to strike out the paragraph with a view to putting them upon the free list.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, to strike out paragraph 240, "Cabbages, 3 cents each."

The amendment was rejected.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

241. Cider, 5 cents per gallon.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I draw the line on cider. After three weeks of arduous labor, we have succeeded upon this side of the Chamber in making only one reduction in the bill, and that was a quarter of a cent upon anvils. Now we have the cider put on the dutiable list. The official reports show that we exported of cider during 1896, \$47,670 worth and imported \$1,704 worth.

I appeal to New England to put this article upon the free list. Every one of us, and we have all been boys, must go back to reminiscences of boyhood in order to find an argument, and a very conclusive one, in behalf of free cider. There can be no pretense that this is in the line of protection, because we supply the domestic market and export nearly \$50,000 worth of this innocent beverage.

Mr. GRAY. It is not for revenue.

Mr. VEST. It is not for revenue, because we imported only sixteen or seventeen hundred dollars' worth during 1896. If there is a temperance man upon the other side of the Chamber, I appeal to him. My judgment, formed upon observation and very considerable experience, is that the use of light wines, beer, and cider is the right road to temperance. The American people never will be a temperance people until we quit the fierce, maddening, life and soul destroying liquors above proof in alcohol and adopt the continental system.

One good thing, at least, they have in Europe, the use of beer and light wines. I believe it is almost a crime in these modern days to confess that you have been to Europe. I saw a quotation from a distinguished statesman upon my own side in politics the other day where he thanked God he was too much of an American ever to have been to Europe. Well, I have been to Europe. I went there for my health, and I am very sorry I am not there now.

Mr. HOAR. May I inquire of the Senator if it is not the fact that that statesman was himself born in Europe?

Mr. VEST. No; he is a native-born American. He thanked God that he never had been there, and said he was too much of an American ever to go there. I said that I wished I was there now. I would infinitely rather be there, on account of my health and comfort, than to be struggling hopelessly over this tariff bill.

Mr. FRYE. Give it up.

Mr. VEST. We can not always give up these things. Every

public man has sometimes to take hold of a live wire, and he can not let go. I saw my friend the chairman of the Commerce Committee, with whom I have labored so many years, wrestling and struggling with a strong disposition to piscatorial exercises, when he felt he was compelled to stay here and wrestle with financial and economic questions.

I have been to Europe, Mr. President. I went there from necessity, and the necessity arose from the fact that you can get no rest in this country. I make no apology for it. With telephones, telegraphs, and the demands upon every man, even in private life, and much more in public life, there is no rest in this rushing, worrying, irritating American life of ours unless we go abroad.

I do not propose to open up the temperance question, but I am defending cider, the liquid of our boyhood, the beverage that "cheers but not inebriates," that sparkles at every New England festival and in every New England home and in the West and South wherever the apple is raised and used. Upon the Continent of Europe you can see from five to fifteen thousand people—men, women, and children—assembled in the gardens every afternoon in family groups, drinking wine and beer and listening to music—not a loud word, not a boisterous expression, the home preserved. If you had that many Americans there, under our system of bibulation, it would not be ten minutes until you would hear the yell of some drunken ruffian and the music of the revolver.

If we want temperance in this country—and I am in perfect sincerity when I say so—we must change our methods of drinking. The desire for some sort of stimulus is natural to mankind. We read in the Bible that as far back as the days of Noah he had not joined the Sons of Temperance. If we would have real, true temperance, obedient to natural appetites, in this country, we must do away with these strong liquors and go back to light wines and the drinks of our childhood—milk, water, and cider.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator allow me? I think it would have been better for Noah if he had joined the Sons of Temperance.

Mr. VEST. But he did not join them. That is the point I am making. We are told that the races of men were divided, and the descendants of Ham were put into slavery because Ham, instead of protecting the old man's weakness, ridiculed him, and the result was that his descendants became slaves.

Mr. President, I make this appeal earnestly in favor of cider. I have heard that at one time there was a distinguished member of this body who came in when a financial bill was being discussed by Senator Sherman, of Ohio. In those early days Senator Sherman was advocating an increased tax upon whisky, nothing like what we have now, but it was considered then an enormous increase. This Senator came in, deposited his hat and gloves upon his desk before him, and said, "May I interrupt the Senator from Ohio?" Mr. Sherman yielded the floor, and this Senator said: "Mr. President, I understand that whisky has no friends in this Chamber. I am the friend of whisky, and whisky is my friend. It builds up the strong and destroys the weak." And he retired from the Chamber after that declaration in favor of his favorite beverage.

If whisky could have an advocate, how many advocates ought cider to have, the beverage of sobriety, the beverage of home? What excuse is there for putting it upon the dutiable list, when we export the amount I have named and receive nothing in the shape of revenue? I appeal frankly and earnestly to New England to come to the rescue of cider.

I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to my amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to strike out paragraph 241, "Cider, 5 cents per gallon," on which he demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I would vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and they will remain paired. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], who, I understand, is not in the Chamber. I therefore withhold my vote. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASCO. Has the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. PASCO. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with my colleague the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I do not see him in the Chamber. I should like to know whether he has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. FAULKNER. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. CLAY. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and vote "yea."

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON]. As he is not present, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bacon,	Harris, Tenn.	Morgan,	Vest,
Bate,	Heitfeld,	Murphy,	Walthall,
Berry,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	White.
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	
Cockrell,	Mills,	Roach,	
Gray,	Mitchell,	Turpie,	

NAYS—28.

Allison,	Fairbanks,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.
Burrows,	Foraker,	McBride,	Platt, N. Y.
Carter,	Frye,	Mason,	Quay,
Chandler,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Sewell,
Cullom,	Gear,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Stewart,
Deboe,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wetmore.

NOT VOTING—40.

Aldrich,	Faulkner,	McEnery,	Shoup,
Allen,	George,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Baker,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Teller,
Butler,	Hale,	Mallory,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Hansbrough,	Mantle,	Tillman,
Cannon,	Harris, Kans.	Martin,	Turner,
Chilton,	Jones, Nev.	Pasco,	Warren,
Clark,	Kyle,	Pettigrew,	Wellington,
Daniel,	Lindsay,	Pritchard,	Wilson,
Elkins,	Lodge,	Proctor,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: I have been advised that I voted in the absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP], with whom I am paired. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my vote. I had not observed that the Senator from Idaho was not here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks leave to withdraw his vote on the previous roll call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 242, page 71, line 21, after the word "Eggs," to insert "not specially provided for in this act;" so as to make the paragraph read:

242. Eggs, not specially provided for in this act, 5 cents per dozen.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out "five" and insert "three;" so as to read:

Eggs, not specially provided for in this act, 3 cents per dozen.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. I wish to call the attention of my friends who are anxious to secure revenue to the fact as shown by the official report. In 1893, under the McKinley Act, at 5 cents a dozen, there were brought into this country \$392,616 worth of eggs. In 1896, under a reduction to 3 cents per dozen under the Wilson Act, we brought in \$88,701 worth. So if it is desired, as I understand it is the case, to obtain revenue, I would suggest that the present duty be retained. Therefore I make the motion.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 243, page 71, line 23, after the words "ad valorem," to strike out the semicolon and the words "albumen, 5 cents per pound;" so as to make the paragraph read:

243. Eggs, yolk of, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALLISON. In behalf of the majority of the committee, I move to insert after the words "ad valorem," and in lieu of the part stricken out, the following:

Albumen, egg, or dried blood, 3 cents per pound; dried blood when soluble, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Senator from Iowa if dried blood is not now on the free list?

Mr. ALLISON. It is on the free list.

Mr. VEST. And it is proposed now to put a duty of 3 cents a pound upon it?

Mr. ALLISON. Three cents a pound on egg albumen and dried blood.

Mr. VEST. I call attention to the fact that the official report shows no imports at all of the yolk of eggs. This duty of 25 per cent ad valorem can not be imposed for the purpose of protecting the American production, as none comes in from abroad at all. In other words, we absolutely control the domestic market. In addition to that, under the amendment the Senator puts 3 cents per pound, I understand, upon albumen and 3 cents per pound upon dried blood.

Mr. ALLISON. Dried-blood albumen.

Mr. VEST. Dried-blood albumen. Now, will the Senator please explain why he wants to take that article off the free list?

Mr. ALLISON. The House provided for a duty of 5 cents per pound. It is largely produced in our own country and imported also. We struck it out, but on a reexamination we provide for a small duty.

Mr. VEST. I could not hear what the Senator from Iowa said. Will he be kind enough to repeat his statement?

Mr. ALLISON. We provide a small duty in lieu of 5 cents a pound provided for by the House. The House provision is 5 cents a pound. We insert 3 cents for egg albumen or dried-blood albumen, and 1½ cents for dried blood when soluble.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator mean to say that they are the same thing?

Mr. ALLISON. They are not the same thing, but they are like things, used for the same purposes.

Mr. GRAY. What are those purposes, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. VEST. I understand that it is a hospital article.

Mr. ALLISON. They are used largely in purifying cloths, etc.

Mr. VEST. They are also used in medicinal preparations.

Mr. ALLISON. They are used in the manufacture of beer as well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. VEST. Let us have a vote on that amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the committee amendment?

Mr. VEST. I do not call for the yeas and nays. I want a viva voce vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, which includes the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 244, page 72, line 1, after the word "Hay," to strike out "\$4 per ton" and insert "\$3.50 per ton, gross weight;" so as to make the paragraph read:

244. Hay, \$3.50 per ton, gross weight.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "\$3.50" and insert "\$2." I call attention to the fact that the revenue derived from a tax of \$4 a ton was about \$900,000, and the revenue derived from a tax of \$2 a ton was \$2,700,000—three times as much revenue on the rate of \$2 a ton as there was on the rate of \$4 a ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. In behalf of the committee, I withdraw the amendment proposed by the committee, and will allow the vote to be taken on the House provision.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator will let me have a vote taken on the proposition I have made.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The Senator from Iowa proposes to raise the proposed Senate committee rate of \$3.50 a ton to \$4 a ton. I ask for a vote by yeas and nays on my amendment reducing the rate to \$2.

Mr. QUAY. Will the Secretary have the kindness to state the amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee amendment to paragraph 244 having been withdrawn, it is proposed to strike out "\$4" and insert "\$2;" so as to read:

244. Hay, \$2 per ton.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS of Kansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WHITE. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BURROWS. I notice that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] is not present. I am paired with that Senator, and I request that my vote may be withdrawn. I voted without observing his absence. I ask leave to withdraw my vote on the last roll call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that we might exchange pairs and vote. I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] and the Senator from Michigan is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. If the Senator has no objection, I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], and that will enable the Senator from Michigan and myself to vote.

Mr. BURROWS. That will be entirely agreeable to me. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	McLaurin,	Roach,
Bate,	Gray,	Mills,	Turpie,
Berry,	Harris, Tenn.	Mitchell,	Vest,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Walthall,
Chilton,	Kenney,	Murphy,	White.
Clay,	McEnery,	Pettus,	

NAYS—29.

Allison,	Foraker,	Mason,	Quay,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Sewell,
Carter,	Gear,	Penrose,	Spooner,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Wetmore.
Davis,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	
Deboe,	Kyle,	Platt, N. Y.	
Fairbanks,	McBride,	Pritchard,	

NOT VOTING—37.

Aldrich,	George,	Mallory,	Teller,
Allen,	Gorman,	Mantle,	Thurston,
Baker,	Hale,	Martin,	Tillman,
Caffery,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Turner,
Cannon,	Harris, Kans.	Pasco,	Warren,
Clark,	Hawley,	Proctor,	Wilson,
Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Rawlins,	Wolcott.
Elkins,	Lindsay,	Shoup,	
Faulkner,	Lodge,	Smith,	
Frye,	McMillan,	Stewart,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

245. Honey, 20 cents per gallon.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out "twenty" and insert "ten," which is the rate in the present law.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, page 72, it is proposed to strike out "twenty" and insert "ten;" so as to read:

245. Honey, 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. VEST. I want to call attention to the official report of exports and imports. We exported of honey in 1896, \$90,959 worth, and we imported \$17,632 worth, showing an excess of exports over imports of more than \$70,000 in the year 1896. There can not be any pretense of the necessity for protection to this simple production, and it certainly does not bring us any revenue. I can not see any necessity for imposing this duty upon an article entirely harmless and entirely necessary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 246, page 72, line 4,

after the word "Hops," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twelve;" so as to read:

246. Hops, 12 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to amend the proposed amendment by striking out "twelve" and inserting "eight."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment, on page 72, line 4, after the word "Hops," by striking out "twelve" and inserting "eight;" so as to read:

246. Hops, 8 cents per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have a communication from a number of hop exporters and importers showing the condition of the trade in hops, and, as it seems to me, the absolute uselessness of this increase in the present tariff. The rate proposed by me is that which is now the law. I will read a statement made by these gentlemen showing the condition of this trade:

NO. 35 PEARL STREET, NEW YORK CITY, March 29, 1897.

To the Senate Finance Committee of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned, hop merchants, exporters and importers, respectfully submit the following statement of facts in relation to the hop trade, to demonstrate that the proposed increase in the duty on hops from 8 cents to 15 cents per pound will be an injury rather than a benefit to the producer, that it will be a hardship to the consumer, and that it will probably prove of no advantage whatever from a revenue point of view, and is therefore against public policy.

First. The present duty of 8 cents per pound affords protection to the extent of fully 100 per cent upon the average cost of producing hops in America. In proof of this it may be stated that on the Pacific Slope, where three-fifths of the total American crop is now produced, hops can be grown, harvested, cured, and baled, ready for market, at a cost of only 8 cents per pound, and can be delivered in New York at 7½ cents. A large proportion of the Oregon crop of 1896 was sold under contract by growers at 6 cents per pound six months before harvest time, and before they had incurred any outlay for the purpose of cultivation. In New York State, which produces the other two-fifths of the American crop, the cost of production is popularly supposed to be 10 cents per pound, but without doubt a large proportion of the crop is now being produced at a much lower cost.

Second. The annual exports of American hops absorb about one-third of our production and have become such a serious menace to the English growers that they are continually beseeching Parliament to protect them against American competition. During the past three years the volume of exports have averaged nearly half the total quantity of hops consumed by American brewers.

Third. The small quantity of European hops which are imported to this country do not really enter into competition with the home product. They are used for special purposes by brewers of high-grade beers, who blend them with American hops in the proportion of about one to ten, mainly to impart to their beer a certain flavor which can not be acquired in any other way, and which will enable them to successfully imitate the flavor of foreign beers. Their special value consists in their peculiar aroma, and it is doubtful if in other respects they possess as much merit as our home product for general brewing purposes.

Fourth. The ratio of imports to exports is, on the average, about 1 to 7 and the extent to which imported hops may be said to displace our native hops is certainly not over 7 per cent of the total consumption of the United States. Even this small displacement is probably fully balanced by the extent to which our exporters are relieved from the competition of Germany in the London market. It is an axiom in the hop trade that London makes our prices, so that the exports of German hops to England are of vastly more importance to the American grower than are the exports of German hops to the United States. In this connection attention should be called to a report made by Louis Stern, United States commercial agent at Bamberg, September 14, 1896, upon the German hop trade, setting forth how seriously the trade in German hops is threatened by American competition in the English market.

And yet we are proposing to protect the American market against competition of this kind, when we are threatening their market abroad and selling a large percentage of our hops.

Fifth. The past four years in the hop trade have been marked by an era of low prices, resulting from constant overproduction. This conclusion is evident from the fact that the consumption of beer has not decreased, showing that the situation was not influenced by the general business depression. The plain truth of the matter is that the majority of the growers in New York State can not successfully compete with those on the Pacific Coast, and it is therefore the refinement of cruelty to bolster them up by creating in their minds a false impression of the probable benefit to them of a practically prohibitive tariff.

Sixth. With regard to the revenue from imported hops, the statistics of the Treasury Department will show that the revenue derived from hops under the operation of the McKinley bill (when the duty was 15 cents per pound) was less than during the same period prior thereto, when the duty was only 8 cents per pound.

Your attention is directed to the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously at a full meeting of hop merchants and growers held in New York on April 2, 1894, and embodied in a petition sent to the United States Senate, to wit:

"Resolved, That the hop trade as a unit deplors the action of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate in having recommended a change in the hop schedule of the Wilson bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives, whereby the tariff on hops is to be changed from a specific to an ad valorem duty, and that the said hop trade unanimously petitions the honorable the Senate of the United States to reinstate the Wilson schedule of specific duty.

"Resolved, That although the opinion of different members of the trade has been at variance as to the amount of said specific duty, they have, after a conference with the hop growers throughout the State of New York, united in petitioning that the rate established by the House of Representatives, to wit, 8 cents per pound, be adopted by the Senate."

We respectfully submit that the proposal to increase the duty upon hops is undesirable from every point of view, and is calculated to cast discredit

upon the protection idea. We ask your committee to grant us the privilege of a hearing.

Very respectfully,

Hugh F. Fox, 35 Pearl street, New York; Rothbarth & Sons, 35 Pearl street, New York; T. Rosenwald & Co., 15 Water street, New York; E. Wattenberg Co., 104 Broad street, New York; Martin Rothbarth & Co., 26 Whitehall street, New York; E. Uchtmann, 17 and 19 Broadway, New York; Carl Ullmann & Co., 17 and 19 Broadway, New York; Hugo Reisinger, 38 Beaver street, New York; S. S. Steiner, 25 Whitehall street, New York; M. Seidenberger's Sons, 25 Whitehall street, New York; C. & L. Heidenheimer, 13 Stone street, New York; Paul Reine-mann, 22 Whitehall street, New York; Charles Zoller, 12 Water street, New York; F. W. Simonds & Son, 18 South William street, New York; Geo. W. Elkins & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Dole Bros. Co., Boston, Mass.; Falk, Wormser & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Chas. L. Kiewert & Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Meyer Supply Co., St. Louis, Mo.; L. B. Van Derveer, Buffalo, N. Y.; Elsas & Fritz, Cincinnati, Ohio; A. Lehman & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Herman Goepfer & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; A. Magnus's Sons, Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland Brewers' Supply Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

The specific duty of 8 cents a pound put in that bill was understood to be entirely satisfactory to the hop growers at that time. Now, notwithstanding the fact that there is only about 7 per cent of the total consumption of hops imported into the United States, notwithstanding the fact that we ship abroad from a third to a half of all the hops raised in the United States, and notwithstanding the fact that American hops regulate the prices and value of hops in the London markets, it is proposed to go through the form of undertaking to increase the price of American hops by raising this duty. There can not be any pretense that it is to raise revenue, because the importation of hops is infinitesimal, and the duty can have no effect, except probably locally, to interfere with the natural operations of trade.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I realize the fact that it is hopeless to obtain any reduction of the items in this tariff bill. I am simply discharging a duty placed upon me by a brother Senator when I send to the desk a communication from the brewers of the city of St. Louis—which has a very large brewing interest—asking that the duty on hops be put back to 8 cents, as under the existing law.

I want to state, Mr. President, that the evidence is incontestable that these foreign hops are absolutely necessary to the American brewer, and that they do not interfere with the hop-growing interest of the United States, because, as my colleague on the committee [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] says, large quantities of American hops are sent abroad and sold in Europe at a profit. There is no rivalry between the foreign hops and the hops grown in the United States, and especially in Oregon.

I send to the desk the communication, and ask that it be read. It is very short.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., April 10, 1894.

Hons. GEORGE G. VEST and FRANCIS M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, representing substantially the entire brewing interest of the city of St. Louis, Mo., hereby petition you, praying for the reasons set forth by the trade committee of the New York Produce Committee, that the duty on hops be restored to 8 cents per pound specific, as fixed by the Wilson tariff bill now pending.

ST. LOUIS BREWING ASS'N,
ELLIS WAINWRIGHT, Prest.
ANHEUSER-BUSCH B. ASS'N,
ADOLPHUS BUSCH, Prest.
THE AMERICAN BREWING CO.,
By HENRY KOEHLER, JR., President.

HOME BREWING CO.,
Per THEO. HEROLD, Prest.
NATIONAL BREWERY CO.,
Per HENRY GRIESEDECK, JR., Prest.
COLUMBIA BREWING CO.,
Per CHAS. F. KOEHLER, Prest.
W. J. LEMP BREWING CO.,
W. J. LEMP, Prest.

Mr. VEST. Here is a communication, in addition to that sent to me by the St. Louis brewers, accompanied by a letter from Hon. Ashbel P. Fitch, formerly a member of Congress from New York. This represents the wishes and opinions of the entire brewing interest of the city of New York.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested. The Secretary read as follows:

From the point of view of the protectionists the proposed increase of the duty on foreign hops must appear exceedingly illogical for these reasons, viz: First. Because the American hop growers are not in any manner affected by the importation of foreign hops, which does not amount to 10 per cent of the entire quantity of hops consumed in American breweries.

Second. Because the question of "pauper labor," which is the determining factor in all legislation of a protective character, is not involved at all in this case, since the exportation of American hops to the pauper-ridden countries of Europe exceeds by 75 per cent the importation of foreign hops to this country—the actual figures for seven years (1882 to 1888) being, exportation 54,976,722 pounds, importation 33,217,477 pounds. (See Statistical Abstract, Treasury Department, for 1888.)

Third. Because the small quantity of foreign hops consumed in American breweries, being used merely for the purpose of producing certain flavors peculiar to certain plants of foreign growth, can not, and unless the market be manipulated by speculators and dealers will not, affect the price of Amer-

ican hops, but will have the effect either of terminating such importations—which is not likely—or of compelling the brewer to pay a higher price for such hops, through an additional and unnecessary tax. It can be shown that the home production exceeds the home demands; but it has also to show that the surplus of domestic production or consumption finds a ready market in Europe at prices rivaling those paid for the foreign article in England. (The latter is borne out by many American hop growers, among them one Mr. Clark, who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means.) Here we have, then, an inversion of the fundamental theory of the protectionist, since the American producer, far from needing protection against "pauper labor," has successfully entered the European markets and "downed" the foreign producer. The money which the American brewer paid for foreign hops during the seven years (1882 to 1888) amounted to \$7,486,259; the money which the American farmer received for hops sold in pauper-ridden Europe amounted to \$14,702,739.

What is said concerning the probable effect or rather noneffect of an increased duty upon home prices applies, of course, only to a normal state of affairs; but it will readily be understood that sharp dealers, and the strongest support of the proposed increase emanates from dealers, may, by a combination of favorable circumstances and their own shrewdness, so manipulate the market as to enhance prices in a manner that will not at all increase the profits of the producer, but simply those of the middlemen.

In the event of a failure of the American hop crops the poor-protected farmer will not be saved by an increased duty, but the brewer would be compelled to seek supply in foreign markets and pay for it an exorbitant tax into the national Treasury, already too plethoric for the common welfare.

The salient point of the opposition to an increased duty may be summed up in a few sentences. The object of protection is to guard the American producer against the competition of the purchasers of the cheap commodities.

In our case the fact is that foreign hops are by far dearer on account of duties, cost of transportation, etc., than the American product, while the American product is being sold with profit to the American producer in European markets at foreign prices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VEST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]; but I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I announce now for the day my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY].

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR. I have announced my pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], but I will transfer that pair to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to state that I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. Otherwise I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Bacon,	Gorman,	Mills,	Tillman,
Bate,	Gray,	Mitchell,	Turpie,
Berry,	Harris, Tenn.	Morgan,	Vest,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Walthall.
Clay,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	
Cockrell,	McLaurin,	Roach,	

NAYS—28.

Allison,	Fairbanks,	Kyle,	Platt, N. Y.
Burrows,	Foraker,	McBride,	Pritchard,
Carter,	Frye,	Morrill,	Proctor,
Chandler,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Sewell,
Cullom,	Gear,	Penrose,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore.

NOT VOTING—39.

Aldrich,	Cannon,	George,	Heitfeld,
Allen,	Clark,	Hale,	Jones, Nev.
Baker,	Daniel,	Hanna,	Lindsay,
Butler,	Elkins,	Hansbrough,	Lodge,
Caffery,	Faulkner,	Harris, Kans.	McEnery,

McMillan,
Mallory,
Mantle,
Martin,
Mason,

Pasco,
Pettigrew,
Pettus,
Quay,
Shoup,

Smith,
Stewart,
Teller,
Turner,
Warren,

Wellington,
White,
Wilson,
Wolcott.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to add to the paragraph what I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of paragraph 246 it is proposed to add:

Hop extract and lupulin, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from Iowa will explain something about the significance of the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Hop extract is imported; 1 pound of it contains the essence of 12 pounds of hops, and it is sold at a very high price.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. About what price?

Mr. ALLISON. Hop extract sells for \$1 a pound.

Mr. VEST. Is there any estimate in the comparative statement as to hop extract and lupulin?

Mr. ALLISON. I have a memorandum here covering the cost. Hop extract sells for \$1 per pound.

Mr. VEST. Is there anything in the comparative statement about it?

Mr. ALLISON. No. Hop lupulin is the hops treated so as to get out all there is in the hops, so that a pound of lupulin is equal to about 4 pounds of hops.

Mr. VEST. What are these articles used for?

Mr. ALLISON. For the same purposes that hops are used for.

Mr. GALLINGER. And for medicinal purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. And for medicinal purposes as well. They are simply the value of the hops extracted and put in a small compass.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator says they are used for medicinal purposes?

Mr. GALLINGER. They are.

Mr. WHITE. Would they not then come under the general medicinal preparation classification?

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose they would. We propose to make the duty 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WHITE. Are they used for anything except medicinal purposes?

Mr. ALLISON. They are used for the same purposes in brewing that hops are and for all purposes for which hops are used. Of course, if hops are made into extracts in this way, they would get a much lower rate than is provided for here, unless we make an ad valorem rate.

Mr. GRAY. What is the revenue to be produced?

Mr. ALLISON. It is not very large.

Mr. GRAY. It is not a revenue measure?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly; absolutely so. It is with a view of securing the revenue both from hops and the extract of hops that the amendment is proposed.

Mr. GRAY. I understood the Senator first answered that there would be very little revenue.

Mr. ALLISON. Very little revenue compared with the revenue from articles largely imported. Of course hops is not a very large article of importation.

Mr. WHITE. Are there any statistics giving the amount imported into this country either of hop extract or lupulin?

Mr. ALLISON. It is impossible to give the figures, because the articles come now under the basket clause of the tariff act. I think there ought to be no objection to this amendment.

Mr. GRAY. It strikes me that before the amendment is voted on we ought to understand whether this tax will not be a serious burden upon an article which, according to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], is a medicinal preparation; and I can understand that it is used as a tonic for invalids, and especially in hospitals, and that there must be some really very weighty reason why we should burden that class of our people with this additional tax. I think that all such tonics and nutritives should be on the free list, unless there is some good reason to the contrary.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think this article is used very largely for medicinal purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning at paragraph 247, as follows:

247. Onions, 40 cents per bushel.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" so as to read, "30 cents per bushel," which is the existing law.

I wish to say a word, but without any hope of changing the result. It is due to the current history of tariff, I think, that it should be stated. We exported of the ordinary American onion \$61,000 worth, and we imported largely more than that of Bermuda onions, but the Bermuda onion, as will be seen by the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, does not at all compete with the onion of the United States. It is an entirely different species of the same genus, and it comes at a time when we produce no onions in this country, even under the hothouse system. The Bermuda onion comes to the United States in January, and from that on until March, and as soon as the American crop comes into the market, the Bermuda onion is not imported here at all and ceases to be a competitor.

Now, the effect of this provision doubling the duty over existing taxation on this vegetable is simply to make those persons who, after a long, hard winter, and especially in the Northern States, desire some vegetable to relieve the natural craving of the stomach and appetite for some vegetable or fruit, pay twice as much as they do now in the shape of taxation. I believe it is an admitted fact by experts in hygiene—naval, military, civilian—that no vegetable is equal to the onion in its beneficent effects on the human system. I heard General Hardee, who, whatever might have been his position in the war, was recognized as the finest hygienic authority in the world, admitted all over Europe to be so, declare once that if you would give him a sufficient supply of onions on shipboard or in the army, he would pledge his life that scurvy would never appear.

When our troops were in front of Atlanta, and, on account of defending in the trenches without moving, were exposed to scurvy and all the diseases incident to the want of exercise and insufficient food, the farmers of Georgia called upon General Hardee, through their representative men, and asked him what they should bring to relieve the army. He said "Onions, onions;" and they were brought there, as many Senators around me know, in great wagonloads, dumped down in the trenches, and the men ate them, oftentimes without salt. The army was healthy, as healthy as any army that could be found, considering the position in which it was placed.

Now, why should we put a double duty on this vegetable, which does not compete with those grown in the United States, which are absolutely necessary at the time of the year when they come in? I leave the matter to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "bushel," in paragraph 247, line 5, page 72, it is proposed to strike out "garlic, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. ALLISON. On behalf of the majority of the committee, I withdraw the committee amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I move to amend the bill by inserting before the words "one cent" the words "three-fourths of;" so as to read, "garlic, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senate will stand by the committee in its first recommendation.

Mr. VEST. The amendment puts back, I understand, a duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound on garlic.

Mr. ALLISON. Three-quarters of a cent. I understand we can produce garlic in this country very largely.

Mr. VEST. Why do you put this duty on, then?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think it will do any harm. It is a small provision.

Mr. VEST. If, as the Senator says, we can produce plenty of garlic in this country, why do you want to put three-fourths of a cent protective duty on it? I am afraid to continue the discussion, however, for fear the Senator from Iowa will put it back to 1 cent a pound, like the old preacher who said, "Blessed are ye who expect nothing, for ye shall not be disappointed."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 248, line 9, page 72, after the word "dried," to insert "20 cents per bushel;" so as to make the paragraph read:

248. Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease, dried, 20 cents per bushel; split pease, 50 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to modify the amendment. In line 8 I move to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" in line 9 I move to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty;" in line 10 I move to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed in line 8 to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" in line 9 to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty;" and in line 10 to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

248. Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 30 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease, dried, 30 cents per bushel; split pease, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. VEST. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa what is the duty in the existing law upon pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages. I have it marked free. I move to strike out all of paragraph 248 down to and including the word "pounds," in line 8, for the purpose of placing those articles, pease, green, in bulk, etc., on the free list, where they are now.

I call attention to the fact that by the comparative statement of exports and imports we exported, in 1896, \$632,000 worth of pease and beans and imported \$297,000 worth, being about three times as many exported as imported; and yet we take this article off the free list and propose to put upon it the high duty of 40 cents, I believe reduced now to 30 cents, under the amendment. I move to strike out the lines I have indicated, so as to leave the article where it is now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In order to perfect the text first, the amendment of the committee is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Finance as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, to strike out what will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 30 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to insert a new paragraph after line 12, to be called paragraph 248½.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a new paragraph the following:

248½. Orchids, palms, dracenas, crotons, and azaleas, 30 per cent ad valorem. Tulips, hyacinths, narcissi, jonquils, lilies, lilies of the valley, and all other bulbs, bulbous roots, or corms which are cultivated for their flowers, 30 per cent ad valorem. Natural flowers of all kinds, preserved or fresh, suitable for decorative purposes, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. I promised myself not to consume any time unless compelled to do it. This is a case of compulsion. I am bound to say, with great respect, that the proposed amendment is an outrage. That we should change the existing law and put a duty now upon these flowers in their natural condition, or preserved and brought in here to decorate our homes or to adorn the dead, is an outrage, in my judgment. It is intended for but one purpose, and that is to enable a lot of nurserymen in this country to charge the people of the United States more for their products. You can not obtain from one of these nurseries an ordinary rose for less than 15 or 25 cents, and some of them are as high as a dollar. They have now, I believe, forty-four different varieties of roses, and the price goes up until a man of ordinary means is guilty of criminal extravagance if he buys even one of them. Go down here and try to buy one of the American Beauties or Jack roses.

I saw some the other day, and, attracted by their beauty, I went in and priced them. They were \$2.50 a dozen. I contented myself by smelling one and walking out. What next will be taxed? The air we breathe? If our Republican friends could find some sort of new invention to seize the atmosphere, they would not only tax the whole of it in the concrete, but tax the nitrogen and the oxygen.

Mr. GRAY. The raw materials.

Mr. VEST. The raw materials. They have taxed everything, and now the flower that adorns the humble home of the poor man, brightens the sick chamber, or goes upon the coffin of our dead is to be put up by this enormous duty to enable the nurserymen in the United States to rob and plunder, for that is the whole meaning of it in plain English. I hope the Senate will vote the amendment down, but it is a faint hope.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to occupy time. Under the act of 1894, the existing law, the great necessity of life known as orchids, which are found in every poor man's home in great quantities, and lilies of the valley are already taxed 10 per cent. The Senator from Missouri four years ago did not observe the absolute importance of these things to the poor man's home.

Mr. VEST. Let me interrupt the Senator from Iowa. He ought to be fair. Is there anything in the act of 1894 that taxes natural flowers?

Mr. ALLISON. Let me read the act:

Orchids—

Mr. VEST. Oh, yes.

Mr. ALLISON—

lilies of the valley, azaleas, palms, and other plants used for forcing under glass for cut flowers—

Mr. VEST. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON—

or decorative purposes, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. That is right.

Mr. ALLISON. We have increased it only slightly.

Mr. VEST. You have now extended it to all natural flowers—a violet or a rose.

Mr. ALLISON. Used for the same purpose.

Mr. VEST. It applies to any fresh flowers that come in. There is no such provision in the act of 1894.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the amendment be read, and we will see how many are incorporated in it that are not found in the act of 1894.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. We have substantially included the same articles put in the act of 1894—

Mr. VEST. No; I beg pardon.

Mr. ALLISON. Except under the stress of revenue we have increased the ad valorem. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not make any further objection to it.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Iowa and I ought to deal with each other frankly. We have known each other a long time, and have served here together a long time. Does he mean to say that he has not put into this item anything except what is in the act of 1894?

Mr. ALLISON. We have put in some other things of like character, but only two or three others.

Mr. VEST. You include bulbs of all sorts.

Mr. ALLISON. Those of like character; similar things.

Mr. GRAY. How about daisies.

Mr. ALLISON. We do not include daisies. They are of domestic growth.

Mr. VEST. I have not a copy of the act of 1894 before me.

Mr. WHITE. I have it.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. WHITE. The act of 1894 in this respect reads as follows: Orchids, lily of the valley, azaleas, palms, and other plants used for forcing under glass for cut flowers or decorative purposes, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. Is that all?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; that is all.

Mr. VEST. Here is the way the amendment reads:

Orchids, palms, dracenas, crotons, and azaleas, 30 per cent ad valorem. Tulips, hyacinths, narcissi, jonquils, lilies, lilies of the valley, and all other bulbs, bulbous roots, or corms which are cultivated for their flowers, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Then follows a provision which never was heard of before:

Natural flowers—

Natural flowers—

of all kinds, preserved or fresh, suitable for decorative purposes, 30 per cent ad valorem.

I am not able to give the information which my friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] asks, whether the amendment includes dog's fennel and Jamestown weed.

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer the Senator that it does not.

Mr. VEST. It must include Jamestown weed, because that has a flower, and a very beautiful one.

Mr. ALLISON. It would only be included where it is used for decorative purposes in some great city house.

Mr. VEST. I have seen Jamestown weed used for decorative purposes, and it is a very beautiful flower.

I am fully justified, comparing the act of 1894 and the proposed amendment, in stating that this is an entire innovation, and was never before heard of in a tariff measure.

Mr. ALLISON. Only a word more. We found in the existing law these flowers used for purposes of luxury bearing a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem. If people go to the pains of importing flowers expensive in their character for purposes of adornment and luxury, why should they not pay a little revenue? That is all there is about it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question in this connection. I am perfectly willing to put a tax, and I do not object to putting an increased tax, on high-grade flowers, such as orchids and some of the others with unpronounceable names that follow here, of which I never heard and do not know anything about, but in the second paragraph the majority have added a class of flowers on which I respectfully submit to the Senate it is not right to have this enormous tax imposed. I refer to tulips, hyacinths, narcissi, jonquils, lilies, lilies of the valley, flowers that are found in every home in the United States, and there is not ten square feet of unoccupied territory in the United States scarcely, before any man's cabin, that has not some of these flowers in it. They are everywhere. They are of universal use, and it seems to me there is no reason

why people should not have these flowers which are in common use everywhere.

Is it a crime that the people of the United States desire to have something that is beautiful for their children, something that will make their homes attractive, something that will add a charm to the cabin, and something which the children of the poor raise in this country?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the Senator think that putting a duty on those flowers when they are imported will prevent the poor people in this country from having them in their gardens?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The finest class of hyacinths and tulips are imported from abroad. The climate is better in Holland than anywhere else for the production of these bulbs. You can not find any such high-grade bulbs for hyacinths and tulips as you get from abroad. The people of this country are entitled to have in front of their cabins as high-class flowers and as beautiful flowers as grow on the face of God's green earth.

The poor of this country ought to be allowed to have these flowers, which are surpassingly beautiful. We all admired them in our childhood, and we have admired them ever since. There is no sense, there is no justification, there is no apology, it seems to me, in undertaking to levy a tax upon this article of almost universal use all over this country. I protest against it, Mr. President. I hope that the Senate will not agree to this amendment.

I move to amend the amendment as offered by the Senator from Iowa by striking out the words "tulips, hyacinths, narcissi, jonquils, lilies, lilies of the valley, and all other bulbs, bulbous roots, or corms."

Mr. VEST. And "natural flowers."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. And "natural flowers." I move to strike out that clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The proposed amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out of the amendment the following words:

Tulips, hyacinths, narcissi, jonquils, lilies, lilies of the valley, and all other bulbs, bulbous roots, or corms which are cultivated for their flowers, 30 per cent ad valorem. Natural flowers of all kinds, preserved or fresh, suitable for decorative purposes, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to my amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. If there be no objection, I will transfer that pair for the day to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 33; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon,	Harris, Tenn.	Morgan,	Turpie,
Bate,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Vest,
Berry,	Kenney,	Pasco,	Walshall,
Chilton,	McLaurin,	Pettus,	White.
Clay,	Mallory,	Rawlins,	
Cockrell,	Mills,	Roach,	
Gray,	Mitchell,	Tillman,	

NAYS—33.

Allison,	Frye,	Mason,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Carter,	Gear,	Penrose,	Spooner,
Chandler,	Hanna,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hoar,	Platt, N. Y.	Wilson.
Deboe,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Fairbanks,	McBride,	Proctor,	
Foraker,	McEnery,	Quay,	

NOT VOTING—31.

Aldrich,	Elkins,	Jones, Nev.	Smith,
Allen,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Stewart,
Baker,	George,	Lodge,	Teller,
Butler,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Turner,
Caffery,	Hale,	Mantle,	Warren,
Cannon,	Hansbrough,	Martin,	Wellington,
Clark,	Harris, Kans.	Nelson,	Wolcott,
Daniel,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 249, page 72, line 17, after the word "less," to insert "and evergreen seedlings;" and in line 25, after the word "stock," to strike out "unless otherwise specified, thirty" and insert "not specially provided for in this act, twenty-five;" so as to make the paragraph read:

249. Stocks, cuttings or seedlings of Myrobalan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, 3 years old or less, \$1 per thousand plants; stocks, cuttings or seedlings of pear, apple, quince and the St. Julien plum, 3 years old or less, and evergreen seedlings, \$1.75 per thousand plants; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 3 cents each; stocks, cuttings and seedlings of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen, shrubs and vines, manetti, multiflora, and brier rose, and all trees, shrubs, plants and vines, commonly known as nursery stock, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Missouri to amendments that I propose in behalf of the majority of the committee in this paragraph, modifying the amendments already reported.

In line 15 I move to strike out "one dollar" and insert "50 cents;" after the word "plants," in the same line, to add "and 15 per cent ad valorem;" and in line 18 to strike out "and 75 cents" and insert, after the word "plants," "and 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. VEST. What does 15 per cent amount to in each case? This is a new section, and therefore I have not any data upon which to calculate.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; it is a new section. There are no data from the old law.

Mr. VEST. There are no data on which to calculate the percentage, and that is the reason why I ask.

Mr. ALLISON. Also, in line 20, I move to strike out "3 cents" and insert "2½ cents." I ask the Secretary to read the paragraph as it would be if amended as I propose.

The SECRETARY. If amended as proposed, paragraph 249 would read:

249. Stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of Myrobalan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, 3 years old or less, 50 cents per thousand plants and 15 per cent ad valorem; stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of pear, apple, quince, and the St. Julien plum, 3 years old or less, and evergreen seedlings, \$1 per thousand plants and 15 per cent ad valorem; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 2½ cents each; stocks, cuttings, and seedlings of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen, shrubs and vines, manetti, multiflora, and brier rose, and all trees, shrubs, plants, and vines commonly known as nursery stock, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Iowa be kind enough to tell us what the per cent amounts to, because we have not the unit of value? He strikes out half of the specific and inserts 15 per cent ad valorem. What is 15 per cent ad valorem equivalent to?

Mr. ALLISON. Of course it is impossible, owing to the variety of prices of these articles, to estimate more than an average ad valorem. It is our purpose, as near as may be, to make an average of about 30 per cent ad valorem. Of course it may be, and probably will be, larger upon some of the very cheap importations.

Mr. VEST. Now, I should like to ask the Senator another question. I confess that that reply is not exactly satisfactory. I would like to know whether we have an increase or a decrease by his amendment. I should like to know why stocks of the Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, three years old or less, are put in with a specific tax upon them. I never heard of that cherry before, and I do not know what it is.

Mr. ALLISON. We are told that it is a very fine variety of cherry; that they are imported by the thousand, and that the duty ought to be a specific value, with a view—

Mr. VEST. To keep it out?

Mr. ALLISON. No; with a view to collect a real duty rather than a nominal duty. So we have provided for a compound duty here instead of a wholly ad valorem or wholly specific duty.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask my friend frankly, confidentially, for the use of the Senate, whether this rate of duty was not suggested on that specific article by some nurseryman who did not want this Canadian cherry tree to come in here and compete with the cherry trees that he is selling. It never has appeared in any tariff bill before.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt it was suggested by nurserymen and others. We have suggestions coming all the time from people who are familiar with the subjects, and nurserymen are familiar with this subject.

Mr. WHITE. There is one word in this paragraph that is new to me. I am not very well versed in such matters. What is meant by "manetti" in this connection?

Mr. ALLISON. Manetti vine?

Mr. WHITE. After vines, "manetti." Then follows "multiflora."

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose it is an Italian plant. I do not know what it is. I will say to my friend from Missouri I think there

is no trouble about this rate. The probability is that on some of these low-priced seedlings the ad valorem, if properly collected, will be more than 30 per cent, and on many of them it will be less. Therefore we make a compound duty so as to equalize matters between the high-priced and the lower priced article.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think I can answer the inquiry of the Senator from California.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator can, because he desires to know.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As I understand, it is the wild-rose stock, imported for the purpose of grafting old ones upon.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

Mr. PETTUS. I merely wish to offer an amendment, if the Senator from Missouri will allow me to interrupt him.

Mr. VEST. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. PETTUS. I beg leave to offer an amendment to the sugar schedule, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. VEST. I should like to hear it read.

Mr. PETTUS. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. PETTUS to House bill No. 379.

The importations into the United States from any foreign country of sugar, or of any material of which sugar can be made, by or for any trust, combination, or conspiracy, existing or hereafter formed between two or more persons or corporations, intended to operate in restraint of lawful trade, or to hinder or restrain free competition, or to increase the market price of sugar in any part of the United States, is hereby declared to be unlawful, and such sugar and such material so imported into the United States shall be forfeited to the United States.

And it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General of the United States to cause proceedings to be instituted and prosecuted to enforce such forfeitures, and to enforce all other laws of the United States intended to prevent or suppress unlawful trusts, combinations, or conspiracies for the restraint of trade or free competition.

And the Attorney-General of the United States will report each year to the Congress of the United States concerning such proceedings so instituted and prosecuted.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Chair to give direction that the amendment be printed immediately, so that it can be returned from the printers for the use of Senators forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. VEST. Under the Wilson bill as it came from the House there was as a duty upon "plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds commonly known as nursery stock, not specially provided for in this act," 20 per cent ad valorem. I think it was upon my motion in 1894 that all nursery stock was stricken out of the dutiable list and put in the free list as paragraph 587.

Unavailing as it will be, of course, I simply want to remark that it seems to me this is a violation of all the rules that should govern a civilized country in regard to the articles that are to be used for the benefit of their people. I have always understood that it was the highest duty of every government to furnish its people with the instrumentalities for improvement in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. It was one of the crowning glories, in my opinion, of Thomas Jefferson, that while he was minister to France from this country, and viewing the great drama of the French Revolution, the fall of the Bastille, the execution of the King and Queen of France, he never for one instant ceased to export by sailing vessels to the United States all sorts of foreign plants and bulbs in order to improve the agriculture of the people of this country.

One significant episode in his life is that he became greatly interested in the culture of rice, which was then just in its incipency in the Carolinas. He went over Europe incognito, crossed the Alps into Italy, after going through southern France, and found in one of the provinces or districts of Italy a very superior article of rice. He was not able to secure any of it for export because the laws of Italy prohibited its exportation, and it is said that the author of the Declaration of Independence filled the pockets of his Virginia overcoat—the old-fashioned Virginia coat, with capes to it, which our grandfathers wore—with this rice, and, to use plain language, smuggled it out of the country. The end justified the means, possibly. He carried it to Paris, put it in small packages of five and ten grains, and sent it to Charleston, S. C., and that was the basis of the South Carolina rice, the finest now in the world. I have always, as a Democrat and follower of Mr. Jefferson, boasted of his care for agriculture and his zeal in sending to this country European plants of every description that might help the people of the United States, both in articles of necessity and even of decoration.

Here the whole system is reversed. A lot of nurserymen, to speak plainly, have gone before the controlling influence of the Finance Committee and shut out by enormous taxation superior trees, shrubs, and flowers that come from Canada and from abroad. They have absolutely now, for the first time (and I have been somewhat familiar with tariff bills in the last twelve or eighteen years), singled out specifically competing products like this cherry, and they have had such a duty put upon it as they know will ex-

clude it from competition with them; and the people of this country are to be made to use the cherries and plant the cherry trees that these gentlemen have on hand and in the market. If that is not protection run mad, I do not know what a financial and economic lunatic asylum is. They have absolutely selected a particular cherry tree and put an enormous duty upon it. If that is not class legislation I should like to have some gentleman on the other side tell me what is.

I do not know what this cherry is. I have been under the impression, from observation and experience, that the finest cherries in the world are raised in the United States. I have never tasted any such cherries elsewhere. It is said that they have cherries equal to them in France, but I have never seen them. The cherry of Washington and Oregon is the finest fruit, in my opinion, that was ever put in the mouth of mortal man. After eating them, which you can do in any quantity without any injury to your health, I have always thought if it had been a cherry in the Garden of Eden, instead of an apple, I would have gone very far toward excusing Adam for taking a bite. But it seems these gentlemen have discovered that there is a cherry in Canada which must be kept out of this country, and instead of having these improved fruit trees cultivated in the United States, in the Middle and Northern States particularly, they are to be excluded by an enormous taxation, whereas they are now upon the free list.

Mr. GEAR. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. GEAR. The Mahaleb cherry is the stock. I do not recollect the cherry called the Mahaleb, but it is the stock on which cherries are grafted.

Mr. VEST. I do not know, but I am as certain as I am that I am speaking in the Senate of the United States that some nurseryman had a job when he had that put in. It was not done by accident, and it was no rhetorical exhibition. There is money at the bottom of it. They never would have picked out this particular cherry tree and put this enormous duty on it except to answer their own purposes. The Senator from Iowa very frankly tells us that he presumes that it was done by some nurseryman. And it is for the benefit of the people of this entire country!

Mr. President, I speak with some feeling about excluding fruit trees. I come from a State where fruit is the greatest possible luxury. The farmer upon the prairie, after the long, hard winter and the struggle with all the opposing forces of nature, appreciates fruit more than anything else—fruit and fish. I shall never vote to exclude from this country any article that goes to add to the comfort of the home of the Western pioneers who have blazed the pathway of civilization against all the rigors of nature, some of them with the ax in one hand and the rifle in the other.

There is no justification for this sort of legislation. We have now in the Treasury of the United States, I see by to-day's statement, more than \$131,000,000 of surplus revenue. I should like to hear from some Senator who believes that the taxing power of the Government should be confined to the actual necessities of the Government economically administered what sort of excuse he finds for voting additional taxes, when the bill as it stands will produce \$50,000,000 surplus every year. And yet the majority of the Finance Committee, not content with the bill as it is, are now putting in amendments at every stage increasing taxation, and increasing it upon articles which, I say, upon every principle of civilization and humanity, should be permitted to come to this country free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendments will be separately stated.

Mr. VEST. I shall move to strike out the whole paragraph, with the view of putting the articles contained therein on the free list, but first let the changes proposed by the committee be acted upon.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 249, on page 72, line 15, after the word "less," the committee propose to strike out "one dollar" and insert "50 cents;" and after the word "plants," in the same line, to insert "and 15 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the word "less," to insert "and evergreen seedlings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the words "one dollar," in line 18, to strike out "and 75 cents."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the word "plants," in line 19, to insert "and 15 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 20, before the word "cents," to strike out "three" and insert "two and one-half."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the words "nursery stock," in line 25, to strike out "unless otherwise specified, thirty" and insert "not specially provided for in this act, twenty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments to the paragraph having been agreed to, the Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Missouri, as he indicated a desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. VEST. I now submit my motion to strike out the whole paragraph as amended, for the purpose of putting all these articles on the free list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to strike out paragraph 249 as amended.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 73, line 3, paragraph 250, after the word "potatoes," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty;" so as to read:

250. Potatoes, 20 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Mr. ALLISON. On behalf of the majority of the Finance Committee I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the committee striking out the paragraph will be regarded as disagreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen." I should not have made that motion if the majority of the committee had stood by its own recommendation; but as we reach each one of these proposed modifications of the high rates as they appear in the Dingley bill the committee seems inclined to give way on all of them and to cause us to abandon the hope that we had that there was to be some reduction in the rates of taxation as proposed by the original Dingley bill. I therefore move to strike out "25 cents" and insert "15 cents," which is the rate in the present law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 250, page 73, line 3, before the word "cents," it is proposed to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen;" so as to read:

250. Potatoes, 15 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, this is another case like that of onions. The imported potatoes do not come in competition with the potatoes of the United States. The Bermuda potatoes come into this country in the winter market. The importation commences about January and closes in March, or possibly in April, when the new potatoes in the United States come into market, and there is no further importation or competition on the part of the Bermuda potato.

Now we come to the next proposition, as I understand it to be, in the platform of the Republican party as to this bill—the question of revenue. There is no protection. The market reports show and all the testimony conclusively establishes that under the McKinley law, when the duty was 25 cents per bushel, in 1893 we collected on imported potatoes \$127,588; under the Wilson Act, after we had reduced the duty from 25 to 15 cents a bushel, in 1896 we collected \$371,485; in other words, the amount of revenue increased over three times under the lower rate. Now we are asked to go back to the McKinley rate of 25 cents a bushel. As a matter of course, it will result in a diminution of revenue, and the motion made by my colleague on the committee ought to be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 251, page 73, line 8, before the word "cents," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five;" and in line 14, before the words "per centum," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the paragraph read:

251. Seeds: Castor beans or seeds, 25 cents per bushel of 50 pounds; flaxseed or linseed and other oil seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; poppy seed, 15 cents per bushel; but no drawback shall be allowed upon oil cake made from imported seed, nor shall any allowance be made for dirt or other impurities in any seed; seeds of all kinds not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I inquire how far the bill has been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the bill has been read and acted upon to the end of paragraph 251.

Mr. HAWLEY. I was listening and waiting for an opportunity to make a suggestion on that. I did not know that it had been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. HAWLEY. My attention has been particularly directed to lines 13, 14, and 15 of paragraph 251, "seeds of all kinds not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem," instead of 40 per cent ad valorem, as the House bill had it. Several Sen-

ators are very largely interested in this matter, and one of them, now absent, intended to make the request that this should lie over; but I can not, in justice to myself and with due regard to the desires of many constituents, permit even this opportunity to pass without addressing a few remarks to the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, entreating their favorable action.

There are among my constituents a large number of men who have been for many years in the seed business. The name upon their packages is worth a dividend to them. Nothing ever went from their gardens that was not what it purported to be. They are distressed very much by the abundant importation of seeds from abroad bearing names not known, or, if known, not respected here, which seeds are dumped upon us, are not pure and true, but are dirty and false, and are a great injury to the legitimate trade. As to the duty, when a man brings in worthless seed, it does not trouble him much to tell a lie about their value when you come to put 25 per cent ad valorem upon them. I want that returned to 40 per cent, as the House put it, to say the least. I concur with several Senators, who wish this to go over for the present for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote adopting the last amendment, making the change to 25, will be regarded as reconsidered.

Mr. LINDSAY. In connection with what has been said by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], I call the attention of the committee to the fact, evidenced by certain papers now here in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that there is a certain Canadian seed, called the Canadian blue-grass seed, which is imported into this country for use in New England, and nowhere else, and that portion not used in New England is used for the purpose of being mixed with the true American blue-grass seed, it being worth about one-fourth as much, and American blue-grass seed has been put under the ban of suspicion everywhere by reason of the admixture. This seed which is grown in Canada—and we object to everything that comes from Canada—which is used only for the purpose of being mixed with an American product in order to render the American product less valuable, is put by this bill on the free list.

I ask the Senator when he is considering New England that he also consider the fact that seed which is not common to New England goes on the free list, and therefore 25 per cent ought to satisfy him in regard to New England seed.

Mr. HAWLEY. Though not comprehending the Senator's advice, I am obliged to him for his information. To use the language of Dick Swiveller, this whole trade is full of "various games of that sort." Of course seed imported under the circumstances referred to by the Senator ought to be stricken from the free list, and ought to go in with the others and pay at least 40 per cent duty.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Before that paragraph is left, I should like to say, in connection with what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] has just said, that I believe with him that in the seed business the name is perhaps of more value than in any other business, except perhaps the jewelry business. I believe a good name in the seed business is equal to a dividend as a rule. I do not believe that seeds brought here from abroad and dumped on the market are likely to do harm, coming even in the way suggested, by reason of the fact that ordinarily I believe nine men out of ten, if not ninety-nine out of one hundred, will buy seeds of seed growers whose names are established and have been well known for years.

For instance, Landreth & Sons, of Philadelphia, have been seed growers for more than a century. I confess I was astonished to get a pamphlet from that concern, saying that they had been connected with the seed business from 1784 up to this time, that from 1784 to 1861 there had been no tariff on seeds, and that the tariff on seeds was first 10 per cent, then 20 per cent, then 30 per cent, and now, for the first time in the history of this infant, which is 113 years old, in the hands of this one concern, the House proposes a tax of 40 per cent ad valorem, and the Senator from Connecticut wants that tax imposed. I believe that the character of these men is sufficient to guarantee the sale of their seeds everywhere, and that no unknown and untried seedsmen can sell seed in competition with such firms as that of Landreth & Sons.

Mr. HAWLEY. The infant industry in this case is the fraud. The old industry was honestly conducted. I have the honor of having known Mr. Landreth very well for twenty-five years, and he asks exactly what I ask, that frauds of that kind may be obstructed.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But the theory on which protection is asked is to protect infant industries; and where we have an establishment of this sort, of more than a century old, it seems to me that the excuse for this enormous tax is not sufficient.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is the thief that came in last night that is the infant industry, and not the honest man, and against the thief we desire reasonable protection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the portion

of paragraph 251 indicated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 252, page 73, line 16, after the word "ton," to insert "gross weight;" so as to read:

252. Straw, \$1.50 per ton gross weight.

The amendment was agreed to.

Paragraph 253 was read, as follows:

253. Teazles, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I believe that the rate of the present tariff law is on teazles 15 per cent. The committee proposes to double it. The enormous amount of \$441 worth was imported last year, and I suppose the committee propose to get rid of this \$441 of revenue by taxing it out of existence. Certainly I suppose there is danger of overflowing the Treasury with the enormous amount of revenue, and so this is to be gotten rid of; otherwise I can not understand the policy of doubling the tax on teazles.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 73, beginning in line 23, to strike out paragraph 255, as follows:

255. Anchovies and sardines packed in oil or otherwise, and other fish packed in oil in tin boxes measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide, and 3½ inches deep, 10 cents per box; in boxes measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide, and 1½ inches deep, 5 cents per box; in boxes measuring not more than 4½ inches long, 3½ inches wide, and 1½ inches deep, 2½ cents per box; when imported in any other form, 40 per cent ad valorem; fish in cans or packages made of tin or other material, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

255. Fish known or labeled as anchovies, sardines, sprats, brislings, sardels, or sardellen, packed in oil or otherwise, in tins, boxes, or cans, shall be dutiable as follows: In boxes or cans containing 7½ cubic inches or less, 1½ cents per box or can; containing more than 7½ and not more than 21 cubic inches, 2½ cents per box or can; containing more than 21 and not more than 33 cubic inches, 5 cents per box or can; containing more than 33 and not more than 70 cubic inches, 10 cents per box or can; if in other packages, 40 per cent ad valorem. All other fish, if in tin packages, or if in packages containing less than one-half barrel, and not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish, on behalf of the majority of the Committee on Finance, to modify the amendment proposed by the committee in respect to this paragraph, and for convenience I have had the paragraph rewritten. I will ask the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators to pay close attention to the change of phraseology. We propose to insert "bottles and jars" with cans and other packages. Fish are imported in bottles and jars as well as in cans, etc.

There is also a modification in the last part of the paragraph, and if Senators will pay attention to the phraseology, they will see the change that is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph as proposed to be modified will be stated.

The Secretary read the paragraph as proposed to be amended, as follows:

255. Fish known or labeled as anchovies, sardines, sprats, brislings, sardels, or sardellen, packed in oil or otherwise, in bottles, jars, tin boxes, or cans, shall be dutiable as follows: Containing 7½ cubic inches or less, 1½ cents per bottle, jar, box, or can; containing more than 7½ and not more than 21 cubic inches, 2½ cents per bottle, jar, box, or can; containing more than 21 and not more than 33 cubic inches, 5 cents per bottle, jar, box, or can; containing more than 33 and not more than 70 cubic inches, 10 cents per bottle, jar, box, or can; if in other packages, 40 per cent ad valorem. All other fish, except shellfish in tin packages, 30 per cent ad valorem. Fish in packages containing less than one-half barrel and not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let me ask for information, Does the proposed amendment make any modification except that it adds bottles and jars to cans and other packages? Does it change the rate?

Mr. ALLISON. That is all, except that we have modified the last part of the amendment by adding "all other fish, except shellfish, in tin packages, 30 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. How does that leave shellfish? What is the effect of that change? I do not quite understand it.

Mr. ALLISON. Shellfish will be on the free list.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As to the tax of 40 per cent on line 2, page 75, of the pending paragraph, what is that under the present law?

Mr. ALLISON. "If in other packages, 40 per cent ad valorem." I think the rate is about 40 per cent now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My impression was that the other rates are about the same as those in the present law.

Mr. ALLISON. It is 40 per cent in the present law.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But the paragraph is constructed differently. It seems to me that the rates are about the same. Am I mistaken in that?

Mr. ALLISON. They are about the same. I do not think there is any increase in that paragraph.

Mr. VEST. I do not know the means of information open to the Senator from Iowa, but I know it is absolutely impossible for a layman, like myself, to know whether this amendment as modified or changed makes an increase or not.

I call attention to the fact that the whole scheme or system of

appraising these goods is changed. I mean to say that under the existing law it is done by the linear inch—so many inches long and so many inches wide of the can or box—and here it is changed to cubic inches, and it is done by experts in the fish trade, as a matter of course, for their own purposes. I have endeavored to find out whether it was an increase or a decrease, but I have been unable to ascertain that fact from any of the experts.

In the comparative statement it is said, without the last amendment of the Senator from Iowa, that the duty is about the same; but it is an indefinite piece of information. I do not think, with the greatest respect to Senators on the other side in charge of the bill, that they know accurately whether it is an increase or not. Of course I take it that the change is made by fish dealers and importers, and that they have, as a matter of course, arranged the schedule so as to make it more difficult to import these fish to come in competition with the products which they sell.

Mr. ALLISON. These changes in phraseology were made after examination by expert appraisers, who stated to us that the effect is not to increase the duty.

Mr. VEST. There ought to be an ad valorem duty upon these fish.

Mr. ALLISON. Senators know perfectly well how reliable the experts are. I have no special knowledge as to these subjects, and we must take the reports of experts as our guide. I have never examined closely these fish in their original packages, but I have no doubt that this is an adjustment that is a wise one. I think there are one or two cases where the duty is increased from 20 per cent to 30 per cent, as I read the old statute, the existing law.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am a little apprehensive that the Senator has been misled in this matter. I notice by the comparative statement submitted by the Treasury Department that these rates are given as the same as those in the existing law; and running over the matter hastily, I thought they were; but I desire to call attention to the law as it stands now, namely, fish "packed in oil, or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide, and 3½ inches deep, 10 cents per whole box." A box 5 inches long by 4 inches wide and by 3½ inches deep would contain 70 cubic inches.

Mr. ALLISON. Would it?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It must necessarily. A box 5 inches long by 4 inches wide and 3½ inches deep would necessarily contain 70 cubic inches. Multiplying 5 by 4 it, would be 20; and multiplying that by 3½ would make 70. Now, the provision standing here says "in boxes or cans containing 7½ cubic inches or less, 1½ cents per box or can." A 70-inch box, then, would contain ten times as much as this, and would be dutiable under the present law at 10 cents, and under this proposed law it would be about 15 cents; which would be an increase of 50 per cent, instead of being the present rate.

My own impression was at first glance that the paragraph was about identical with the old law; but I think, on examination, that it is an increase of about 50 per cent; and that there is a larger increase in another respect. The language of the present paragraph is "containing 7½ cubic inches or less." So that if it contains only half as much, the gross tax is 1½ cents per inch, if that remains in the law.

Take the next clause in the pending paragraph:

Containing more than 7½ and not more than 21 cubic inches, 2½ cents per box or can; containing more than 21 and not more than 33 cubic inches, 5 cents per box or can.

I think the entire paragraph is an increase of something like 50 per cent over the existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 256, page 75, line 8, after the word "act," to strike out "and herring, fresh, one-half of 1 cent per pound" and insert "one-fourth of 1 cent per pound;" so as to make the paragraph read:

256. Fresh-water fish not specially provided for in this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out paragraph 257, as follows: 257. Herring, pickled, salted, smoked, or dried, and all fish not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

257. Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half of 1 cent per pound; herrings, fresh, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. VEST. Wait a minute, Mr. President. I want to call attention to paragraph 256, in regard to "fresh-water fish not specially provided for in this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound."

Mr. GRAY. They ought to be free.

Mr. VEST. Under the existing law these fish come into the United States free. The total amount of fresh fish of all sorts imported in 1896 amounted to \$900,000. We have 10,000 miles of seaboard, and we have in the interior of the country splendid rivers and lakes teeming with fish, and yet we are to put this duty

on, and to take this article, an article of absolute necessity as a food, from the free list and impose a duty on it in the name of either protection to American fish or else of revenue.

Here is the list of exports: Of fresh fish we exported \$84,814; of dried fish, \$448,286; of herring, \$96,462; of mackerel, \$15,692; of other fish, \$104,374; of salmon, \$3,348,889; of other fish, again, \$167,981; of shellfish we exported \$291,707, and of oysters \$696,179, being in the aggregate largely above the imports that come into the United States of an article, as I have said, of prime necessity as a food; and yet we put this duty upon it and take the article off the free list either for revenue or for protection, or for both, and I am unable to see that it does either.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I hope that now, even in the face of the ironbound rule of the caucus, the Senator from Iowa and the other Senators in charge of this bill will give a moment's favorable consideration to the proposition to keep these fresh fish where they are now—on the free list. There is no article of food that is more universally necessary and more universal in its use, at least on the Atlantic Seaboard and in the region of the lakes, than the fresh fish that are brought to the daily markets of the large and small cities and towns that are within reach of that industry. In these hard times, when we are told that men are starving, these times when depression and want stalk our streets, it does seem rather hard to interpose any difficulty between the masses of the people and their access to this important and absolutely necessary article of food.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me, if he will look at page 172 of this bill, he will find on the free list:

Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice (except salmon), caught in the Great Lakes or other fresh waters by or for American fishermen or citizens of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. I see the provision is:

Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice (except salmon), caught in the Great Lakes or other fresh waters.

That is better than I supposed.

Mr. VEST. What paragraph is that?

Mr. GRAY. Paragraph 535½. That, however, does not apply to fish caught on our Northern Seaboard, or where a person who happens to live on the border line of Canada comes in with a load of fish.

Mr. ALLISON. It does not apply to the Atlantic Seaboard.

Mr. GRAY. I do not know that there are many cases of the kind, but if a load of fish comes in caught by a Canadian fisherman, why should this difficulty of a tariff exaction be imposed, not upon the fishermen, but upon the people who go to market to spend their scant earnings in something that will sustain life and sustain it in a healthful and wholesome fashion?

Mr. President, the duty, as read by the Senator from Missouri, is not very great, and the reports do not show very large importations, but the duty is not the chief difficulty. The very fact that you arrest a load of fresh fish and compel it to go through the red tape of custom-house officialism destroys in large part its value, and instead of coming fresh to the tables of those who ought to be able to enjoy the bounty of the sea, they have to wait the weighing and the custom-house inspection, and if they get them at all, they get them deprived in large part of what makes them appetizing and useful.

Mr. ALLISON. This is a very light duty.

Mr. GRAY. Why should there be any duty?

Mr. ALLISON. The fish are caught in the sea by fishermen.

Mr. GRAY. Of course they are.

Mr. ALLISON. Our American fishermen are under the impression that they ought to have a little advantage.

Mr. GRAY. They have the advantage of free access to the sea, and why should not the thousands and thousands who depend upon this wholesome food have some consideration? Why should they be taxed for the benefit of fishermen who already exercise a gainful calling?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will remember, for it is within his recollection (I am sorry I have not the document before me), that a committee of this body, of which ex-Senator Edmunds was chairman, made an investigation as respects the effect of taking off the duty, and it was found that there was no change in the price of fish to the American consumer. It is quite a report, made, I think, in 1890; I do not remember the number. It disclosed that a small duty does not affect the price of fish at all. It is only a question as to who shall have control of the local markets as respects fish—our fishermen or the Canadian.

Mr. WHITE. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to what possibly may be an ambiguity in phraseology. It has been suggested by an expert. It is said, "It has always been a matter of controversy as to what constitutes fresh-water fish. Many fish are migratory, and are caught at different periods both in salt and fresh water." I desire to inquire whether the phraseology of the bill is of a character to remove that difficulty?

Mr. ALLISON. That is a difficulty. I suppose the Potomac is called a fresh-water river, and yet it empties into the sea.

Mr. WHITE. A fresh-water fish may be caught in fresh water, and the same sort of fish may be caught in salt water. Does that change the character of the duty?

Mr. ALLISON. This phraseology has been uniformly used, and I do not think there has been any difficulty.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There has been.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator from California propose any modification?

Mr. WHITE. I have no amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think it is a serious matter.

Mr. WHITE. I thought the Senator's attention might have been directed to it before.

Mr. VEST. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. I do not exactly understand the phraseology. Paragraph 256, on page 75, reads:

Fresh-water fish not specially provided for in this act.

Paragraph 535½ of the free list is as follows:

Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice (except salmon), caught in the Great Lakes or other fresh waters by or for American fishermen or citizens of the United States.

Those are on the free list. When you speak of fresh-water fish and then fish caught in the lakes, does that mean the same thing? Suppose a salt-water fish should get into the lakes?

Mr. ALLISON. It means the same thing as respects fresh waters or rivers. The lakes are described as the American lakes.

Mr. VEST. This excepts salmon, which are at one time a salt-water fish and at another time a fresh-water fish.

Mr. LINDSAY. Shad?

Mr. VEST. It also includes shad and herring. It is a peculiar quality of the salmon and the shad that they go back to their first habitat, where they spawn. We have a stream in Arkansas, the Washita, where I have seen as fine shad as I ever saw in the Potomac. I have seen shad from that river weigh 5 and 6 pounds, and as palatable as any I ever saw in the city of Washington.

It happened a long time ago that a gentleman who lived in Maryland went for his health to the Hot Springs in Arkansas, and he had a great passion for shad. His health was restored. He was quite a fisherman, and he determined that he would bring the shad out and put them in the Washita River; and they are there to-day in large quantities. They go out to the ocean at a certain time of the year and return in the spring. They are caught in large quantities. My friend the Senator from Arkansas knows that, as I know it personally. There is a salt-water fish, and yet you catch it in fresh water.

I do not see why salmon should be excepted. The official reports show that we exported 3,084,884 pounds of salmon put up in cans. The effect of this amendment in the free list—I am discussing it in connection with the other, although we have not reached it—is simply that if the fish are caught by a Canadian fisherman, they must pay the duty, unless he is paid by an American fish dealer. If he is paid by an American fish dealer, they come in free; and yet we hear peans and appeals in behalf of American labor. A fish dealer under this provision can go over into the Canadian waters or the waters of the Great Lakes under the jurisdiction of Canada, and employ the professional Canadian fishermen and never pay one dollar to an American fisherman. Yet he can bring in his fish free, because the fish are paid for and the Canadian fisherman is paid by the day or week or month with the money of the American. It seems to me that is no protection to American labor. It is simply a protection to the speculator in fish in order to put up the price of the fresh fish to the people of the United States.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out paragraph 257 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

257. Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half of 1 cent per pound; herrings, fresh, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out paragraph 258 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

258. Fish, pickled, in barrels or half barrels, not specially provided for in this act, and mackerel or salmon, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound; fish, smoked, dried, salted, pickled, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, and fresh fish, all the foregoing, not specially provided for in this act, and fish skinned or boned, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to modify the amendment of the committee by inserting the phraseology I send to the desk in lieu of that originally proposed.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment which was originally reported it is proposed to insert:

Fish, fresh, smoked, dried, salted, pickled, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, not specially provided for in this act, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; fish, skinned or boned, 1½ cents per pound, mackerel, halibut, or salmon, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask how this compares with the present rate. Are the fish provided for in this paragraph free under the present law?

Mr. ALLISON. I think not. It is a slight increase over the

present rate under the entire paragraph. The only change from the printed paragraph, as the Senator will see, is that we have provided a higher duty on fish skinned and boned. It has always borne a higher rate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think some of the classes of fish mentioned here are free. I am not positive about it, however, but where 1 cent a pound is provided in the pending amendment, three-fourths of a cent has been the rate heretofore.

Mr. ALLISON. Codfish and mackerel have been slightly raised.

Mr. VEST. Some of these fish were put upon the free list by the Wilson Act. This is therefore a great change, even under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa. I do not understand the effect of the amendment. It is impossible to do it in a running debate of the provisions of the bill. Of course it will be adopted as the committee have proposed it, and I will let it go.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Finance as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out paragraphs 259 and 260, as follows:

259. In addition to the duties otherwise provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, upon all fish imported from any country or dependency which pays an export bounty on fish, a duty equal to the amount of such bounty.

260. Cans or packages, made of tin or other metal, containing shellfish admitted free of duty, not exceeding 1 quart in contents, shall be subject to a duty of 6 cents per dozen cans or packages; and when exceeding 1 quart, shall be subject to an additional duty of 3 cents per dozen for each additional half quart or fractional part thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in line 18, paragraph 261, after the word "apples," to insert "and pears;" and in line 19, after the word "peaches," to insert "pears;" so as to read:

Apples and pears, green or ripe, 25 cents per bushel; apples, peaches, pears, and other edible fruits, including berries, when dried, desiccated, evaporated or prepared in any manner, not specially provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. The committee wish to propose an amendment to the amendment. In line 18, after the word "apples," I move to insert "peaches, currants, quinces, cherries, plums."

Mr. FRYE. Green?

Mr. ALLISON. Green or ripe.

Mr. VEST. What is the necessity for the amendment, when the Senator has, in lines 19 and 20, the words "and other edible fruits?"

Mr. ALLISON. The fruits here provided for are green or ripe. The others are dried or desiccated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment as amended will be agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 261, line 22, after the word "act," to strike out "2 cents" and insert "1 cent;" so as to read: "1 cent per pound."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 261, line 23, after the word "pound," to strike out the semicolon and the words "berries, edible, in their natural condition, 1 cent per quart."

Mr. ALLISON. The committee withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Are not the same things mentioned twice? I should be glad to have the paragraph read to see how it stands.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to propose another amendment, and then it can be read. After the word "quart," in line 24, I move to insert "cranberries, 25 per cent ad valorem." Now, I think we have nearly everything in here.

Mr. VEST. The Senator has left out blackberries.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Now let the paragraph be read as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

261. Apples, peaches, currants, quinces, cherries, plums, and pears, green or ripe, 25 cents per bushel. Apples, peaches, pears, and other edible fruits, including berries, when dried, desiccated, evaporated, or prepared in any manner, not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound; berries, edible, in their natural condition, 1 cent per quart; cranberries, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALLISON. That is right.

Mr. VEST. In line 18, paragraph 261, I move to strike out "25 cents per bushel" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

I wish to call attention to the fact that in 1896 we exported \$1,340,507 worth of dried apples and we imported \$481 worth. Four hundred and eighty-one dollars against an exportation of

\$1,340,507! But I suppose we are in great danger of losing the American market. Of green apples we exported, in 1896, \$930,289 worth and imported \$95,000 worth; and in the face of these statistics we are to increase the duties. I have no doubt that in the next campaign the rural districts will resound with Republican eloquence telling the farmers how they have been protected in their orchards. Four hundred and eighty-one dollars imports of dried apples against \$1,340,507 worth; \$95,000 worth of green apples imported against exports of \$930,289! Yet our Republican friends will tell their dear bucolic supporters that they have died in the last trench in order to protect the orchards of the farmer from the invasion of the foreign apple, the pauper apples of Europe.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out paragraph 262 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

262. Comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits preserved in sugar, molasses, spirits, or in their own juices, not specially provided for in this act, 35 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 5 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this act, 35 per cent ad valorem and in addition \$2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 5 per cent; jellies of all kinds, 35 per cent ad valorem; pineapples preserved in their own juice, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. This is a considerable increase over existing law.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 10, before the words "per centum," I move to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" and in line 14, before the words "per centum," I move to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" so as to increase the percentage of alcohol.

Mr. VEST. The Government statistics show this condition of commerce in regard to these commodities: Of preserved fruits we exported, in 1896, \$1,376,381 worth; of other fruits, \$60,353 worth; of all other fruits, \$1,868,353. We imported of fruits in their own juices, \$207,931. Still, these duties must be raised in order to protect us against foreign importation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 10, paragraph 261, page 77, before the words "per centum," it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" and in line 14, before the words "per centum," it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" so as to read:

Comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits preserved in sugar, molasses, spirits, or in their own juices, not specially provided for in this act, 35 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 10 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this act, 35 per cent ad valorem and in addition \$2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 10 per cent.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 263, line 18, page 77, after the word "prunes" to insert the word "prunelles;" so as to read:

Figs, plums, prunes, prunelles, raisins, and other dried grapes.

Mr. ALLISON. In paragraph 263, line 18, after the word "prunelles," I move to insert "2 cents per pound" and a semicolon; so that it will read:

Figs, plums, prunes, prunelles, 2 cents per pound;

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in the same paragraph, line 19, to strike out "and one-half;" so as to read, "2 cents per pound:"

Figs, plums, prunes, prunelles, 2 cents per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not know but that we should save time by allowing these amendments to be adopted, and then make the motion I desire to make. I wish to move "1½ cents" where the Senator proposes "2 cents," and "one and one-half" where he proposes "2½ cents." I suppose I may as well make a motion now to strike out the rates in the bill and insert "1½ cents" in each instance.

Mr. ALLISON. Let me perfect the paragraph first, and then the Senator can make his motion.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is immaterial to me which course is pursued.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in line 23, before the word "cents," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty;" so as to read:

Olives, green or prepared, in bottles, jars, or similar packages, 20 cents per gallon.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senate to disagree to the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. That perfects the paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It begins to look as if all the committee amendments heretofore reported are to be withdrawn, and it might be done quicker in bulk. I will not insist on that being done, however. I move to strike out 2 cents where it was inserted on motion of the Senator from Iowa and insert "1½ cents."

Mr. MILLS. It ought to be 1 cent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The present rate is 1½ cents.

Mr. MILLS. It ought to be 1 cent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am satisfied that is true, but I prefer to stand by the present law; and I make the motion in that way, because it is the existing law. I move to strike out "2½ cents," in line 19, and insert "1½ cents;" and in line 21 I move to strike out "2 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem;" and I ask for a vote on all of the amendments together.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend paragraph 263, on page 77, line 18, by striking out "2 cents per pound" and inserting "1½ cents per pound;" in line 19, by striking out "2½ cents" and inserting "1½ cents," and in line 21, by striking out "2 cents per pound" and inserting "20 per cent ad valorem;" so as to read:

Figs, plums, prunes, prunelles, 1½ cents per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 1½ cents per pound; dates, one-half of 1 cent per pound; currants, Zante or other, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, that has reference to the duty on Zante currants. The duty proposed in the pending bill on these currants from the island of Zante is 125 per cent. The unit of value is 1.6, and the duty is 2 cents per pound. Of course that is more than 100 per cent. I could understand this high rate of duty if it were for the protection of some American product, but these currants are peculiar to a single little island, I believe, in the Gulf of Corinth. They grow nowhere else in the world; they can not grow anywhere else in the world. I have conversed about them with intelligent persons who have been on that island and investigated this business.

Mr. GEAR. What does the Senator state the duty to be?

Mr. MILLS. The duty is 125 per cent here.

Mr. GEAR. Let me state for the benefit of the Senator from Texas that when the present law was framed the currants were worth 1 cent a pound. They had been classed at 10 cents by the Wilson committee, and when the bill came here, through my friend from California and my friend from Arkansas, there was a duty of 1½ cents a pound placed on them, which is 150 per cent. So this is really a reduction.

Mr. MILLS. I am talking about what it ought to be, not about what any of my friends have done heretofore. As I said, there is nothing to protect in the United States by this high duty. Therefore we must have a revenue duty.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Texas allow me to correct a statement of fact?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. I will take pleasure in presenting the Senator with a small box of Zante currants, a sample produced in California, where they are grown in large quantities, and in the cloakroom I have a so-called Zante currant bush which is really a grape bush. I will state that they are as much in competition with the other raisins in California, for they are all a raisin, as any dried grape can be, and furthermore, that the importation from the island of Zante cuts a very small figure in the total importations into the United States. The currant is largely produced in Greece, and the name "currant" is derived, I believe, from the word "Corinth." It is really a grape. There is a bush in the cloakroom which the Senator can inspect.

Mr. MILLS. Anything can be called a Zante currant by name. I am talking about the currant that is grown upon the island of Zante.

Mr. WHITE. This is the exact and identical currant.

Mr. PERKINS. If my friend from Texas will permit me to correct the premises from which he is reasoning, I desire to state that the general appraisers of New York held to the views that my distinguished friend from Texas holds, but the ninth judicial court of the district embracing California and Oregon judicially determined otherwise. With the Senator's permission, I should like to read the findings of the court, but I will not interrupt him; I will wait until after he has made his argument. Then I should like to have the privilege of reading the findings of the court.

Mr. MILLS. Several years ago I studied the question of Zante currants when I was trying to reduce the revenues of the Government, which were excessive; but our friends who were opposed to it would not permit a reduction upon articles that were competing with domestic articles. I proposed even to take this revenue article and put it on the free list, in order simply to reduce the surplus revenues of the Government. I remember conversing with a very eminent gentleman, Hon. Samuel Sullivan Cox, known to all of us, who was the minister to Turkey and who was all over the island of Zante time and again. He told me that the real Zante currant could not be grown in any other soil on the face of

the globe than upon that island. While we may grow currants like it, they are not Zante currants. The importation into this country of \$1,185,532 worth of these currants shows that the same article can not be produced in this country, call it by whatever name you please.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, he overlooks one great elementary principle of protection, and that is, if the people can not get the currants, they have to take the California grape.

Mr. MILLS. Precisely; but there is always a certain number of people who must get the Zante currants and pay 2½ cents or 1½ cents. It was in 1893, when the duty was 2½ cents a pound, that they imported \$1,185,532 worth of these very currants, notwithstanding we are told that California is full of them.

I remember the remark of my distinguished friend, Judge Kelley, no longer with us, but many of us here knew him well. When I was proposing to put these currants on the free list, I said, "They can not come in competition, my friend, with anything you want to protect in this country. Let us put them on the free list and reduce the revenue. The Treasury is full to overflowing." Mr. Cleveland was telling us that that was the condition which confronted us—not theories, but an enlarged Treasury. I said, "Now, let me put this on the free list." He said, "My dear sir, the taste is a question of culture, and if you will keep the Zante currant from coming into this country, we will encourage the cultivation of the blackberry and develop the American taste for blackberries." That was one of the reasons given.

Now we are told that there are Zante currants grown in California. It may be, for they do remarkable things in California. It is a great State, and a great fruit State. It is the greatest flower State in the Union. The largest roses I ever saw in my life, I will say to my friend from Missouri, who was speaking about flowers this morning, I have seen in California. The finest fruits of almost all sorts are grown there. But we know there is a peculiar taste to fruits, a peculiarity given by the soil itself.

A few years ago I was going through a remarkable campaign in Texas on the question of prohibition, and I was an antiprohibitionist. An old friend of mine, whom I had known for a long time, came to me and said, "I am astonished, sir, to find you going around over this country and defending the saloons." I said, "Your astonishment is not greater than mine. You have drunk ten times more whisky than ever I saw in my lifetime, and you are a prohibitionist. I want you to explain that to me." He said, "Yes, sir; I am a prohibitionist, but I do not expect prohibition to keep me from drinking whisky. I do not intend it for that. I drink the very best whisky that is made in the United States. I know where it is to be had, sir. I know where there is a peculiar soil that raises a peculiar corn, and where there is a peculiar water; and the peculiarity of the climate, and the peculiarity of the soil, and the peculiarity of the water give a peculiar taste to the whisky." He said, "That is found in Robertson County, Tenn. I bring my whisky from there, sir, and I expect to have it as long as I live." I asked him, "What is it that you want to have prohibition for?" "Not for myself," he said, "but for the Irish and the d—d niggers." [Laughter.]

I give this illustration to show that there is a peculiarity about things. There is a peculiarity that adapts itself to the taste of people in the manufacture of certain kinds of goods and certain kinds of stamps upon goods. I once heard a gentleman who was a manufacturer of stockings (it was when we had up the question of the balbriggan stockings) say that his wife would not wear the American stockings, that her taste was to have the imported stockings, and he got some of his own stockings that he was manufacturing and put the balbriggan brand on them and she was reconciled. She did not know anything about it; it was a pious fraud practiced on her; and she wore the stockings of her own husband's manufacture all the time. It is so about all these different things. There are peculiarities of taste in men and peculiarities of taste in products that commend themselves to people who are seeking for this, that, and the other thing for consumption.

I have not a single, solitary doubt but that in California they have the finest grapes. I know it. I have been there and I have seen them and eaten them. They have the finest fruits. It is one of the greatest States in the Union. As I said, they have flowers there that can not be equaled elsewhere on the face of the globe or in any other place on the globe where I have ever been. But, Mr. President, they have not the Zante currant, and these figures show it. Therefore we ought to put a revenue duty on them instead of putting on this high, exclusive duty of 125 per cent.

Mr. PERKINS. I am very desirous to have my friend from Texas vote for this measure, and while I may not convince him, perhaps, that he should do so because we raise Zante currants in California, as I can demonstrate to him, I am sure I can have his vote if he is consistent, and he always is, upon the revenue question.

In 1890 Zante currants were upon the free list. The Government received nothing from their importation. In 1894, at a cent

and a half a pound duty, we received \$29,478.22. Under the proposed duty of 2 cents it is estimated that we will receive \$39,304.28. Therefore we should have the Senator's vote upon the ground of revenue, if upon no other.

But as a matter of fact, we do raise the Zante currant in California. We have in California more than 4,000 vineyards, owned by 4,000 different individuals, who employ from fifteen to twenty thousand men, women, and boys in cultivating those vineyards. They have demonstrated the fact that they can raise the Zante currant. We have had a substitute, the Thompson seedless grape, the Sultana, and perhaps 10 per cent of the Muscat of Alexandria are seedless and similar to the Zante currant. There is the Zante currant [exhibiting], and I will defy my friend to distinguish it except that it is better. The Zante currant is raised in Sutter County, Cal., in the central part of our State. It is raised upon a vine the same as the grapevine and not upon a currant bush. The Zante currant grows upon a regular grapevine so far as the ordinary unscientific eye can determine.

But I want to show, and I am going to be brief on this point, because I feel confident that my friend from Texas will vote with us, what was the finding of the court. I will first read from a brief submitted by a committee of the raisin growers of California on the raisin industry of California, and in which is embodied several quotations from the opinion of the court:

The Zante currant is a grape. It grows upon a grapevine, and not on a bush or shrub, as is commonly supposed. It has all the characteristics of the grape, is treated similarly for commerce, and is essentially a grape as much as the Muscat, the Catawba, or any other variety, and is used as a raisin.

This statement has recently—March 26, 1896—been judicially determined to be true by the circuit court of the United States, ninth circuit, northern district of California, in a case appealed from the decision of the Board of General Appraisers on duty at New York.

In Circular No. 77, dated May 27, 1896, issued by the Treasury Department, this opinion is published, and all customs officers are instructed to be guided by it.

Witnesses for importers in this case undertook to contribute to the popular misconception as to the Zante currant by testifying that it is not a grape. But evidence of the highest character from many experts who had seen this so-called currant growing on the island of Zante and on the mainland of Greece and in California and elsewhere showed it to be unmistakably a grape. The court, in its opinion showing the result of the evidence, said:

"The term 'Zante currant' is a well-known commercial expression among importers, dealers, and growers of raisins, and relates to and comprehends a kind of raisin made from a small seedless grape grown not only in the island of Zante, but also, and to a much greater extent, on the mainland of Greece and other neighboring localities. 'Zante currants' is simply its English name. It derives the name 'currants' from the fact that in times past it was shipped from the city of Corinth, Greece. In German it is called 'Korinthen'; in French, 'raisin de Corinthe'; in Spanish, 'pasas de Corinto.' It is a raisin grape, as distinguished from the shrub currant, with which its name may confound it, but from which it is entirely distinct, the former belonging to the grapevine family, or *Vitis vinifera*, of plants, the latter to the shrub or Ribes. A Zante currant on the vine is a small-sized grape. When picked and dried it is a 'dried grape' or kind of raisin whose popular and commercial designation is 'Zante currants.'"

The court then shows that this definition is in accord with that given to the word "currant" in the Century Dictionary, Webster's International Dictionary (1890), Encyclopedia Britannica (1877), and the Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1885).

One witness, Dr. Gustav Eisen, the author of a valuable book upon the raisin, traced the history of this grape as far back as the year 1333.

E. W. Hilgard, professor of agriculture at the California State University, testified that a Zante currant is "a raisin made from a small grape which grows in the Ionian Islands, and also in the archipelago there; also on the mainland of Asia Minor. They are dried and prepared in various ways and shipped all over the world." Many other distinguished scientists and agronomists were called as witnesses, to the same effect.

Among the exhibits used at the trial was a currant vine taken up by the American consul at Patras, Greece, which was fully identified as a grape belonging to the species *Vitis vinifera*, and wholly distinct from the English or kitchen-garden currant of the species *ribes*. Photographs of the vine growing in Greece, on the mainland, and on the island of Zante, and also growing in California, were introduced.

I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the opinion of the court. The court said:

Without going further into the evidence, it is enough to say that, as a whole, the following four propositions of fact were, to my mind, conclusively established: (1) That the currants comprising the importation in question are Zante currants; (2) that Zante currants are a kind of raisin; (3) that Zante currants are grapes dried; and (4) that Zante currants are not the product exclusively of the island of Zante, but they are produced also on the mainland of Greece, in the archipelago, and other places, and in much larger quantities than on the island.

That was the decision of the court after hearing the evidence of Professor Hilgard, who has the chair of agriculture in our State University, and other eminent scientists. There was a grapevine sent by the American consul from some port in Greece. It was exhibited in the court, and it was there demonstrated to the satisfaction of the court that it was a facsimile of the same grapevine, the same character of raisins or grapes or Zante currants that we were producing there.

But, be that as it may, Mr. President, the imported Zante comes into competition anyhow with the raisins of California. I believe that, in so far as it is possible to do so, we have our home market for our own home production. We have demonstrated the fact that we are capable of raising in California a sufficient quantity of raisins and currants to supply this country, and we are doing it to-day at a less price than they were ever furnished before.

Years ago, when I was engaged in merchandising, I sold the ordinary Malaga raisins at from 20 to 25 cents a pound. To-day they are selling in the markets of the principal cities of this coun-

try at from 4 to 6 cents a pound. The price has been brought down by competition among our own people, who had the courage to go out West from Texas, Missouri, and other States and settle upon those arid plains, bring in water from the mountains, irrigate the valleys, and plant their grapevines and produce these raisins and currants.

There is no industry of this country that is deserving of a fostering care and a helping hand more than the raisin industries of the country. I went the other day to one of our stores, and I there bought two packages of Zante currants, imported, at 10 cents a package, and the package weighs 1 ounce less than a pound will. Will the half-cent increase in duty here increase the cost to the consumer? My friend from Texas knows that it will not. It simply will increase the revenue derived by the Government from this source.

I have here the consular reports. I will read one line to show that our friends in Greece are trying to do something to build up this industry there, to foster it with their own people, and then dump their product upon our own country. Mr. George Horton, who is our consul at Athens, writes:

There is much popular agitation in Greece at present, resulting from the low price of currants, the principal crop of this country. A general idea has spread among the people that the Government is able to raise the price of the crop at will, and there is a popular demand that Parliament pass some measure to that end. Large mass meetings are being held in various parts of Greece, and considerable excitement prevails.

That is because the people of California, by their energy and their push and their enterprise, have produced raisins and currants that are taking the market of Greece away from those people and giving it to our people.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from California a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said about the wonderful growth of the industry of raising currants and the manufacture of raisins in California. How long has the industry been in progress in that State?

Mr. PERKINS. In 1880 we first commenced planting grapevines successfully—that is, the muscat of Alexandria, and producing the Malaga raisin.

Mr. GRAY. And the currants?

Mr. PERKINS. The currants later.

Mr. GRAY. I understand that the currant production has been a very prolific one, and certainly, from the specimen we have seen, a very beautiful one, and that you are succeeding now in taking away the market in Greece.

Mr. PERKINS. We hope to do so, with your kind assistance.

Mr. GRAY. Then why do you want an additional protective tariff?

Mr. PERKINS. Because the wages we pay in California to our own people range from \$1 to \$1.50 a day. Those people have families, and they are teaching their boys and girls the first lessons in American citizenship; they are supporting our public schools, our churches, paying taxes in our own country, and we want to continue to pay the same high wages that we are now paying them.

Mr. GRAY. I understand that there was no tax at all on the Zante currants up to 1894. Is that true?

Mr. PERKINS. That is not correct.

Mr. GRAY. They were on the free list in 1890.

Mr. PERKINS. From 1879 until 1891 there was a duty of a cent a pound. In 1891 they were upon the free list.

Mr. GRAY. Notwithstanding all that, the industry has flourished in a most interesting and gratifying way.

Mr. PERKINS. It has languished.

Mr. GRAY. I do not see why they should make this demand upon the consumers and upon the home market to pay this additional tribute.

Mr. PERKINS. For the same reason, I will say to my friend from Delaware, that has prevailed in Greece. The consul says, and I think it answers the Senator:

The currants are low in price—

That is, in Greece—

mainly because there has been overproduction. If all the farmers in the United States for some one year should plant all their land to one crop the price of that crop would fall. This is practically what has happened in Greece.

And they have had to find a market, and they ship them to this country in foreign ships to compete with our people.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understood the Senator to say a while ago that it was the progress of the currant industry in California that had broken down the price of currants in Greece.

Mr. PERKINS. No; my friend misunderstands me. It is the competition of the low prices that have prevailed in Greece by overproduction, and because they have not been honest in shipping their products into this country. I will take the testimony of our consul. I will read one more paragraph. Our consul, Mr. Horton, says:

In the haste to get large quantities of the profitable article on the market arose another condition that ultimately injured the price of the crop. Inferior currants were packed and sold as first-class, and in many cases sand even was sprinkled in the boxes to add to the weight.

That class of fruit has been brought in here to compete with us. I expect my friend from Kentucky to join with my friend from Texas, as I know my colleague will, and vote for this measure for revenue, if for no other reason.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I simply wish to correct some statements made here which I know were made inadvertently.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] spoke of an authority from which he derived his information that the so-called Zante currant is grown only upon the island of Zante. A very little familiar history will show how much in error was the party who gave that information. We placed in our last tariff act a provision for Zante currants, fixing the rate at a cent and a half a pound. It was claimed that the expression used referred only to currants coming from the island of Zante. Although we had used it, no doubt, in the act as we would use the words "Lima beans," "Malaga grapes," or any expression of that sort, still it was otherwise held in a case that was not very carefully considered in the custom-house in New York. Afterwards, when an invoice came to San Francisco from Patras, the matter was decided in the suit referred to by my colleague, which is entitled "In re Wise, collector, 73 Federal Reporter, page 183." The judge, in delivering the opinion, among other things, said:

As a matter of fact, the evidence tended to show that much larger quantities of Zante currants, so called, are grown and exported from the provinces of Greece than from the island of Zante, and that those grown on the mainland are still known commercially in this country as "Zante currants." In other words, "Zante currants" is the commercial name for this variety of grape, when dried into raisins. It would be unreasonable to suppose that Congress, in imposing duties on Zante currants in the general language employed, intended to tax those coming from the island of Zante alone and not those which come in much larger quantities from other localities.

That, of course, disposes of the contention absolutely that they are solely a product of the island of Zante. Again, every scientific work on the subject defines Zante currant as a true raisin. If Senators who have any doubt on the subject will take the trouble to look at the bush which was sent me by Mr. Onstott, of Yuba County, Cal., whose product I have here, they will be unable to distinguish it from any other grapevine they have ever seen. The leaves are precisely alike, and the bunches of fruit, which of course are now very small and green, are formed very much as the Zinfandel grape grows.

The English currant, which we see growing in our yards, is an entirely different product, so much so that wine is made out of the grape produced on the currant bush; but now we in California have produced not only a large raisin, which is generally known as the Malaga raisin of commerce, but a large number of smaller raisins without seeds. Among those are the Zante currant, so called, and other varieties, I believe, of the seedless grape. The Zante grape—for it is truly a grape—is a competitor with all of the other classes of raisins, and if we are to utilize this tariff bill for any purpose whatever with reference to raisins, there should be no exclusion of the Zante currant, which is itself a true raisin and comes from a true grape.

So, in looking over the matter, when the case to which I have referred was in the course of preparation, the counsel upon neither side could find a single authority anywhere to the contrary, and to settle the dispute we took the trouble to send to Greece to get an actual Zante currant bush and produced it in court as an exhibit. It was precisely the same bush that I have here now in the cloak-room. So there was nothing in that point. While the suit was pending, the Zante currants, under the decision of the board of appraisers, were admitted free, and we lost a very large amount of revenue.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I have been unable to follow the Senator's statement fully, and I should like to ask him whether he is in favor of the duty on Zante currants or not?

Mr. WHITE. I have always been in favor of a duty on Zante currants, and a duty on a good many other articles, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, produced even under the shadow of his influence. I am not opposed to duties, and I have never said so.

Mr. HOAR. I did not put the question to the Senator from California with the view which he seems to suppose. I put the question very much as General Taylor employed bloodhounds in the Seminole war, not to worry the Indians, but to find out where they were. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I do not exactly know to whom the Senator refers by the Indian in this case; but his wisdom is frequently so occult that I am not able to reach conclusions regarding it.

All I desire to say, in conclusion, Mr. President, is that the Zante currant of commerce and the raisin should be treated alike, and if we are to have a bill imposing duties at all, the whole class of raisins should be retained.

Mr. GEAR. I used to be a merchant many years ago, and I have sold a great many of the goods called Zante currants. It is purely a commercial phrase, as everybody who has investigated the matter knows. They are a very low, inferior order of grape

that have been grown in Corinth and in the island of Zante, which gives the name of "Zante currant" to them. They are imported in large quantities. They are a very inferior article of goods and sold at a very low price. I recollect prior to the McKinley law they were but a cent or a cent and a quarter a pound. We put them on the free list because we found that they were used largely by the plain people of this country (as Mr. Lincoln used to call them) in making pies and puddings.

Mr. GRAY. And very good they are, too.

Mr. GEAR. They do not compete with the Zante grapes of California, which my friend refers to. There is 4 cents a pound difference. When our Democratic friends were framing the Wilson tariff bill they found that they wanted revenue. It was claimed that Zante currants were high priced, and they put a duty on them of a cent and a half a pound, which was about 150 per cent, for they were only worth a cent to a cent and a quarter a pound.

Greece is a pretty poor country, as we all know, and they keep no minister here; they only have a consul-general of the Greek Government, who lives in New York. I can not recall his name.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Botassi.

Mr. GEAR. Yes; Mr. Botassi. He came to me for a letter of introduction, and at his request I introduced him to the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives when the bill was pending between the two Houses in conference, Judge Montgomery and Judge Turner, who were conferees on the part of the House, and also gave him a letter to my friend Hon. William L. Wilson. Mr. Botassi went down to the Arlington Hotel to consult with Mr. Wilson, who gave him an audience and treated him very courteously.

Mr. Botassi told Mr. Wilson that Greece was a very poor country and that their product did not really come into competition with the California grapes; that they were sold at 1 cent a pound and used by a different class of people; that they were quoted at that price in New York. Mr. Wilson said to Mr. Botassi: "You will get no protection in this bill for your people. Our Democratic friends are demanding an increase on all these things. The Senator from California is preeminent, and these duties will stand." When I saw him after the interview with Mr. Wilson, I said to him, "Mr. Botassi, how did you come out?" He said: "I did not come out at all. I went down to the Arlington and I had a very delightful interview with Mr. Wilson. He knows more about my country than I do, though I was born in Greece. He knows all about her ancient history, her wars, her statuary, her art, and everything else, 'but he not know a tam ting' about currants. And that was substantially true. [Laughter.]

The whole theory of the duty of 1½ cents a pound on Zante currants in the Wilson law was based on the assumption that there was competition between the Grecian and the California currant, when any man who is a merchant can understand the difference between these two articles; and yet our committee has seen fit to increase the duty to 2 cents a pound, which I shall vote for, because I believe in protecting the grapes of California; but I shall vote for it upon a different principle from what the Senator from California does.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] has demonstrated that what I stated was correct. He says that these grapes from Zante or from Greece do not come in competition with the American currants, that our currants are worth 4 cents a pound and the imported Zante currants are worth from 1 cent to 1½ cents a pound. That is what I stated, that this duty can not be for protection, and that it is too high for revenue.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state to the Senator that I purchased at a leading grocery in this city two packages of Zante currants, supposed to be a pound avoirdupois, but they weighed but 15 ounces, and I was charged 10 cents a pound for them. We sell our best California currants for less than that.

Mr. MILLS. Still they are quoted at 1.6 cents a pound officially. I am going by the official tables, and not by the prices charged by retailers every day all over the country.

Mr. PERKINS. What I intended to say was that the consumer did not get the benefit of it.

Mr. MILLS. I am talking now about the Zante currants coming in competition with the California currants. I say the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] has demonstrated that they do not; and if they do not, what is your excessive duty going to do? You can not bring them into this country and naturalize them, to use the expression of the protectionists; it is impossible to do that; and my friend from California on this side of the Chamber [Mr. WHITE] says that in the judicial investigation to which he has referred he brought a plant from Greece into court and demonstrated that it was the same plant they have in California; but he did not pretend to say that he could bring the atmosphere and soil of Greece with it.

My father was a Virginian, born over in eastern Virginia, and lived and died in the belief that there was no real, pure chewing tobacco except "the Jeems River," as he called it; and he chewed "Jeems River" as long as he lived. When I was a boy, he sent to

Cuba and got the seed of the celebrated Cuban tobacco to make into cigars, and I used to make cigars for sale when I was a chap. Every other year he would have to send to Cuba and renew the seed. Why? The seed sent here was from the same plant precisely that they have in Cuba, and it was grown in the United States, but they could not bring the Cuban soil and the Cuban climate, and the tobacco degenerated and became American tobacco by a process of differentiation, or evolution, as I suppose the scientists would call it. In Cuba the soil and climate entered into the tobacco. I remember when it was growing the first year on our land in Kentucky, if you occupied a position a quarter of a mile from the field and the wind was blowing in your direction across the field, you could smell the delightful aroma from it, but the third or fourth year it was gone.

Mr. President, we may make high tariffs and put on all sorts of duties, but we can not change the law of nature. These things are peculiar gifts to man, and the influences of soil and climate, all those things that God in His wisdom has made, we can not change. Our wants go out to them all over the whole face of the earth, and we send the products of our labor in exchange for them.

I want to again call the attention of our friends to the fact that when you are putting these prohibitive duties on things coming to the United States you are putting prohibitive duties against the things that we produce by our labor going away from the United States; you are depressing the prices of things that we have to sell and upon which we have to get a living, and you are raising the prices of the things that we have to buy and upon which we have to live.

I return to the proposition with which I set out. I am willing to vote for a revenue duty, and a good substantial revenue duty, on this article, but I can not see why our friends, who can not produce this article by any amount of fostering in this country, will insist upon high duties simply to exclude the article from coming to this country and exclude our cotton going from the South to pay for it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I understand the argument of my friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], it is that because there is a greatly inferior fruit raised in Greece that we can not hope to emulate Greece in the raising of that fruit, even if we were to bring the vine and plant it in our own State. Of course we would not attempt any emulation of that kind; but I believe that even an inferior fruit, when it competes with a superior fruit, is more liable to depreciate the general market, so far as that proposition goes, if it is material at all, than a fruit that is of equal quality. I believe that that is the experience of everyone. Of course I have my own theory about the ultimate effect of all this.

I believe that ultimately there will be such a large quantity of this fruit produced that it will be a very difficult problem for those engaged in making this particular product to know what they are going to do with it; but I am taking the theory of this bill and following it through, and I am very certain, taking the whole production as expressed in the words "raisins" and "Zante currants" together, that we are imposing a duty which will yield a large amount of revenue, but which will not go over the average of this bill.

I differ entirely with my friend the Senator from Texas that this article will be excluded. I think he will ascertain by the end of the fiscal year that we will have some revenue out of it, and while it has been said here that this bill will yield \$50,000,000 of surplus, I must say for myself that I think the surplus will be exceedingly small, unless we recover some of that prosperity for which we have been looking for many days, and for which we have very recently prayed.

Mr. MILLS. Zante currants by the law of 1890 were free, and we imported \$1,185,533 worth of them when they were on the free list. The law of 1894 put a duty of a cent and a half a pound upon them, equivalent to about 93 per cent, and the importation fell down to \$32,783.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will excuse me, that is a mistake. I said a few minutes ago, perhaps while the Senator was not in the Chamber, that the General Board of Appraisers of New York held that the tariff only applied to currants produced in the island of Zante, and admitted all the others free.

Mr. MILLS. Then these figures are not correct.

Mr. WHITE. Only as to the island of Zante, and not to the general importation of currants.

Mr. MILLS. Of course I can only go by the figures which have been furnished us.

Mr. WHITE. What I have stated is the fact.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the three amendments proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] to paragraph 263.

The amendments were rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 264, on page 78, line 1, after the word "grapes," to strike out "and peaches, 1 cent

per pound" and insert "in barrels or other packages, 20 cents per cubic foot;" so as to make the paragraph read:

264. Grapes in barrels or other packages, 20 cents per cubic foot.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 265, on page 78, line 4, after the word "pomelos," to strike out "three-fourths of 1 cent" and insert "1 cent;" so as to read:

265. Oranges, lemons, limes, grape fruit, shaddock or pomelos, 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 5, after the word "pound," to strike out the remainder of the paragraph, as follows:

And in addition thereto, 30 per cent ad valorem upon the boxes, barrels, or other articles containing any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That the thin wood, so called, comprising the sides, tops, and bottoms of orange and lemon boxes of the growth and manufacture of the United States, exported as orange and lemon box shooks, may be reimported in completed form, filled with oranges and lemons, by the payment of duty at one-half the rate imposed on similar boxes of entirely foreign growth and manufacture.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out paragraph 265 as amended and insert the paragraph which I send to the desk, which is the paragraph in the present law relating to those articles.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 265 as amended and in lieu thereof to insert:

265. Oranges, lemons, and limes, in packages, at the rate of 8 cents per cubic foot of capacity; in bulk, \$1.50 per 1,000; and in addition thereto a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon the boxes or barrels containing such oranges, lemons, or limes: *Provided*, That the thin wood, so called, comprising the sides, tops, and bottoms of orange and lemon boxes of the growth and manufacture of the United States, exported as orange and lemon box shooks, may be reimported in completed form, filled with oranges and lemons, by the payment of duty at one-half the rate imposed on similar boxes of entirely foreign growth and manufacture.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of course I know it is utterly useless to undertake to get any change in any of these rates, and I shall not enter into any elaborate discussion of this proposition, but I have the reasons so clearly shown why my amendment should be adopted and why the high rate in the bill should not be adopted in a letter sent to me from New York that I shall read the letter, which comes from an importer. He says:

NEW YORK, March 25, 1897.

RESPECTED SIR: We desire to call your marked attention to paragraph No. 265 in the new tariff, fixing the proposed duty on imported green fruit—i. e., oranges and lemons—at the rate of three-fourths of a cent per pound, which, we feel confident, is an error due to a misunderstanding of the circumstances surrounding its importation, and one which will work radical injury to the poor of our city and to those who are engaged in bringing this most healthful form of food into the country.

The present duty is specific at 8 cents per cubic foot of capacity of the box, and 30 per cent ad valorem on the boxes, making a total duty of about 23 cents per box, while the proposed change raises the duty, each box weighing from 80 to 100 pounds, to 60 or 80 cents, or equivalent to an increase of, say, from 200 per cent to 300 per cent.

While the consumption of Sicily lemons alone for the year ending November 1 last amounted to 2,382,300 boxes, the total amount produced in this country, from California only, was about 300,000 boxes, Florida being absolutely out of the question, owing to the unfortunate ruin of her groves by frost, and will continue to be for several years to come.

As lemon trees take ten years' growth to come into full bearing, and there is no way to supply the large diminution in imports which will unquestionably occur if this apparently unjust and unnecessary discrimination is made against foreign lemons, it can but work injury to the poor of our cities in favor of an undeveloped industry of the State of California, which is entirely inadequate to the task of supplying the country at large, even were it given a full opportunity to do so.

And this same argument holds good in regard to the cheap Sicily oranges, which, selling to people of scanty means at a cost of 1 penny each, do not seem to call for protection to such an exorbitant degree in favor of the California orange, "the rich man's fruit," as its sobriquet is, since a cost of, say, 5 cents is far beyond their slender means.

We do not hesitate to express our views thus frankly, as we are not only foreign-fruit experts, but also steamship agents for a line which is bringing into the country (at this moment) fully one-half of all the fruit that is imported from Italy, and we know that our views are those of a majority of the people engaged in the fruit business at this the largest fruit center in this country.

In our capacity of steamship agents we also beg leave to tell you that it is a practical impossibility for the correct duty due on fruits imported to be ascertained without causing an unnecessary and cruel loss to the fruit owners and steamship lines.

Green fruit is imported by steamships which carry little or nothing else, in cargoes of an average of 20,000 boxes, which consist of from 300 to 500 different brands and shipments.

To ascertain the weight of the fruit in these boxes it will be necessary to weigh several boxes of each lot by removing their contents, to the destruction of beautifully packed and ornamented inside coverings materially affecting the market value of boxes so destroyed, nor can the large proportion of rotten fruit which oftentimes is found in part of the boxes, be ascertained by the examination of a few of them, and we submit that rotten fruit is no more a proper article for taxation than any other absolutely valueless article.

The above-mentioned method of weighing boxes will further entail an unjust and unwarrantable delay in the management and delivery of our cargoes, which are discharged on docks whose rental amounts to \$70 per day, and those cargoes, consisting of perishable merchandise, deteriorate more every day they are detained.

The importation of bananas last year amounted to 12,000,000 bunches, free of duty, and they could easily bear a part of the burden which has been placed upon lemons and oranges, without affecting the retail price in the least degree, and at the small duty of only 10 cents per bunch would yield

the Government an increase in revenue of \$1,200,000, and afford a much-needed protection to our constantly increasing crop of apples, which now suffers from their competition.

In view of the above circumstances, we pray you that you will use your great influence to prevent the injury to and (at least) the partial destruction of a business upon which at least 100,000 of our citizens depend for their means of subsistence.

Mr. Henry W. Mitchell goes to Washington this afternoon in connection with the subject-matter of this letter, and will stop at the Metropolitan Hotel. Should you desire any further information on the subject, it will afford him great pleasure to place himself at your disposal.

Yours, very truly,

VILLARI, MITCHELL & CO.

HON. JAMES K. JONES,
915 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

This letter shows distinctly and clearly that the present proposed tax on this article will prove a very great detriment to this trade. These oranges and lemons can not be examined by the appraisers under the provisions of this bill without very materially injuring them.

There is practically no competition now between Sicily oranges and California oranges. Take one of each and show them to anybody, and there will be no hesitancy about the value. One will sell for 5 cents, and you may buy the others for a cent apiece in this town. Recently when I wanted to buy oranges, when I was present with a member of my family, 50 cents a dozen was the price asked for California oranges, and a cent apiece was the price of the other oranges. Nobody would hesitate a moment to say that those selling for 50 cents a dozen were infinitely cheaper than those at 12 cents a dozen. There is practically no comparison between the two. If this class of fruit is allowed to come in, it will reach a class of people who would probably buy the lower priced oranges and use that kind of fruit, and there ought not to be an increased rate to prevent the importation of the cheaper and lower grade simply because there is a similar kind of fruit produced in this country.

Mr. PERKINS. Only a word, Mr. President, in answer to my friend from Arkansas. The letter which the Senator has read is a special plea from the agent of a foreign ship, manned by foreigners, built in a foreign country, and representing the product of foreign toil.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does it tell the truth?

Mr. PERKINS. I have no doubt of the truth of what I have stated, for I have a duplicate of the letter which the Senator read, or one similar to that, which was written to me. No doubt the writer of the letter has told the truth, as he understands it, from his standpoint. He is advocating the interests of those he represents. He is the agent of a foreign ship, built in a foreign country, manned by foreigners, and he represents the product of a foreign soil. The owners of that ship do not pay one dollar tax to this country.

I stand here, Mr. President, representing in a small degree the horticulturists of this country, especially those in my own State, and we have demonstrated that we can raise citrus fruits, lemons and oranges, equal to any other country on God's footstool. All we ask—we do not want any protection—is the difference between the price we pay for labor in this country and that paid in foreign countries.

I want to say as to the ad valorem duty fixed in this bill, that I have made a careful calculation of it, and it is a much less figure than that levied by Russia, by Germany, by Denmark, and by Austria-Hungary, and the result is neither one of those countries raises citrus fruits, either lemons, oranges, or any other belonging to that particular citrus family.

The duty proposed is a reasonable duty; it is a fair duty; and when the Senator says that this fruit can not be weighed, and objects that the duty is not specific, I ask what can be more specific than the imposition of duty by weight? Every barrel of sugar that comes into this country from Germany or from any other country, every cask of brandy, has the gross weight, the tare, and the net weight marked upon it.

So far as damaged fruits are concerned, the fact of the damage can be verified by the weighers. In answer to that, I may say that I have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury stating that there is no trouble whatever in weighing fruit that comes into this country.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a specious argument, a special plea by the agent of a steamship company. Every transportation company of this country is coming down to a weight basis, and their freight is classified upon a weight basis. I am in the steamship business myself, and I know how easy it is to juggle with figures about measurements. You can measure an oblong, a square, a triangle, or a torpedo-shaped box; and it takes quite a mathematician to make a calculation of the contents. The steamship men, from what I know of them, generally favor their side of the house, or the agents do certainly. Therefore, it is fair, right, and proper to have this specific duty by weight.

As to the special plea about the damage to the fruit, my friend knows well—because he is thoroughly conversant with the law—that if there is 10 per cent damage to any of the fruit, they have

the right to reject it and to surrender it to the Government, and therefore it pays nothing. If there were 100 boxes of lemons, or lemons, or oranges, and it was found that 10 of them had been spoiled on the voyage, the importers simply segregate them and say to the inspector: "We surrender that 10 per cent of this invoice," and that is the end of it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have a letter here, Mr. President, from a genuine importer of fruit, who is not connected with any steamship company, and which is a strong support of the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. The letter comes from Charleston, S. C., and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested. The Secretary read as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 7, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 4th instant has our attention. Replying to the same, we beg to state we have no data to give on the subject except what we have written you of in our first letter.

The entire matter, condensed in a nutshell, is that a duty of 1 cent per pound will simply be prohibitory.

The following points, we think, can be used by you to good effect. The average price the year round on oranges and lemons from foreign countries will not exceed \$1.55 per box. This you can have confirmed by reference to sales made by Messrs. Brown & Seecomb, of New York City, the largest fruit auction house in the United States, and headquarters for the sale of foreign oranges and lemons.

The weight of a box of lemons or oranges is 80 pounds, and the duty of 1 cent per pound means 80 cents per box; to this add the cost of the box, paper, wrapping, and freight, and you will see that it will not bring more than expenses, leaving nothing for the growers. The consequence will be that imports will cease, and the price will be such that only the wealthy can use them; whereas were they free, they would have no effect on the Florida nor the California crop, because they are such inferior goods to either one of the domestic crops.

Again, 50 per cent of the foreign crop has been marketed before the Florida crop begins, that is about November 1; and three-quarters of the crop from Florida has been marketed before the California begins, which is about December 10.

As we have said before, the quality of the foreign fruit is so much inferior to either the Florida or the California fruit that even when Florida had her crop of 5,000,000 boxes they sold for 50 per cent more than any Mediterranean fruit did, and do now, and will always continue to do so.

We again beg leave to assert that it is only the poorer classes who buy the imported fruit, as anyone who can afford it will readily pay double the price for a Florida or California orange that he would for an imported one; and as we have said in our first letter, the duty can not help Florida or California, and must deprive the poor of the fruit and simply prohibit the importation of fruit.

If the proposed duty is passed, the result will prove our prediction, and will be a great imposition on the middle classes.

As regards the grape fruit or shaddock, they should remain as they are now—that is, free. There is none raised here to speak of; the industry is only in its infancy, and it will take years before any size of a crop is raised at all. Florida and California together do not raise one thousandth part of the consumption. This fruit is mostly used in a case of sickness, and they weigh from about four to five pounds each and sell for from five to six dollars per hundred, and if this duty of 1 cent per pound is imposed upon them, you can see just about what it means.

Regarding difference between duty per pound and duty per thousand, it will require double length of time to weigh a cargo of oranges in bulk (in which way a good many are imported) than to count them. Besides, oranges are sold by the thousand and not by weight, and we think complaints would be caused on this score alone, not to say that extra costs would be put to the Government; and this, added to the fact that only the moderate classes would suffer, should be called to the attention of the Senate.

If this high tariff is passed, it will not only deprive the poor man of his oranges and lemons, but will take away revenue from the Government, furnish less freight for steamships and railroads, less business for importers and brokers.

We can not see why the entire people of this country should be taxed simply to enable a few growers in Florida and California to sell their products for more than market price. Nor can we be persuaded to believe that high protection will improve the quality of the imported orange and enable them to be put on competition with California or Florida oranges, which are of so much superior quality.

If the Senate passes this tariff, we hope they will find comfort in the misery and oppression they will cause the poorer classes by it. Thanking you for your kind attention and wishing you success,

We remain, very respectfully, yours,

HENRY BAYER & SON.

HON. JOHN L. McLAURIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, as anxious as I am to see the end of the tariff discussion, and as unwilling as I am to protract it even for a few moments by any contribution of mine, I can not allow this schedule to pass without adding my protest to that of other Senators in regard to the iniquity of the proposed duty. It is a good illustration of the devastating effect that a surrender to the principle of commercial restriction works upon otherwise good and clear minds. Once grant the power to any class to use the sovereign power of the country for their own benefit, and at once all the evil characteristics that attach to power and to despotism will characterize its exercise.

Mr. President, this is a wanton and a cruel tax upon the poor people of this country. My amiable and good friend the Senator from California, who I know has as much of the milk of human kindness as anyone, is yet a good illustration of what I have just spoken of—how forgetful he may become of the wider interests of humanity and of kindness and of benevolence, which generally possess his breast, when he becomes the advocate here of an especially greedy and grasping interest.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Delaware a question?

Mr. GRAY. Not now; as the Senator from Massachusetts says, not until I conclude what I am saying.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to know to which Senator from California the Senator from Delaware refers.

Mr. GRAY. I am speaking to the Senator from California in front of me [Mr. PERKINS].

In reply to the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator said, with a good deal of warmth of feeling I thought, that the Senator from Arkansas was making the plea of an importing agency and of transportation companies as against the interests of the fruit growers of the section of country represented by the Senator from California. If we were merely to balance the selfish interests of those two classes, I do not know whether we might not say that both are deserving. I do not see why the one deserves encouragement and commendation and the other malediction and reproach. It is an honest business, as the Senator from California knows, to engage in the transportation of the bounties of nature across the sea, and to bring them from one country to another in order that they may be enjoyed as widely as possible. But he has spoken of the class of fruit growers for whom he takes the floor, and he has commented with a good deal of severity upon the other class.

I wish to say that in the few words I shall utter I am speaking for a much larger and much more meritorious class, and that is the great body of the consumers of this country, those forgotten people of whom the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] spoke so eloquently the other day. I am speaking for every fever-wasted patient in a hospital. I am speaking for the poor wan boy and girl who, in the paroxysm of fever, need a cooling fruit that can be bought for a penny apiece. I am speaking for those who are excluded from the high-priced productions of the California groves and the Florida groves, and it is on that account that I thought it worth while to delay the Senate, for a few moments at least, while the car of progress in this cruel and, as I have characterized it, wanton proposition rolls along.

Mr. President, this tax, unless the figures I have are entirely erroneous, will amount to an increase of 411 per cent over the Wilson Act, the present tariff law, and an increase of 280 per cent over the McKinley tariff act of 1890. What is the justification for it? The letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN], just read, states, and states truly, I have no doubt, that the oranges that come from Sicily, inferior in quality to California and Florida oranges, selling for a cent apiece where the others sell for 5 or 6 cents apiece, come at a time when the Florida orange and the California orange are not in the market. They supply a vacuum in the market and do not seriously interfere with the American production. But if they did, what of it? Why, then, should we put ourselves at the mercy of those who have been blessed with the bounty of nature and have been able to cultivate this fruit, no doubt to their own advantage, and pay the high wages that American workmen enjoy? Why should we, in their interest, put this additional tax to go not into the Treasury, but into the pockets of the favored few who have so developed this industry as has been portrayed by the Senator from California?

If those orange groves have flourished, if this industry has been fairly profitable in the past, why do they seek additional profit to be levied not out of the ordinary commercial competition of the world, but from legislation and out of the pockets of the people who can least afford to pay it?

Mr. President, this is all I intend to say. It is all I can say. It pertains to all this schedule. It pertains to the pineapple as well as to the orange, for the pineapple, as we will see further on, is to be made a very expensive luxury, and it will take out of the reach of the poor people of this country a healthful, necessary fruit product, one that adds to the enjoyment and comfort of the people and does a little to relieve the hardship of those who have to toil for their daily bread and for the scant subsistence which in distressed times comes to them. I do not see why we should now approve such a wanton and cruel proposition.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I can not permit the remarks of my friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], the philanthropic views which he has so feelingly expressed in sympathy for the sick and fever patients, to go without extending to him my right hand of fellowship in sympathy. I think, perhaps, that is one reason why I feel it incumbent upon me to champion the citrus growers of California—the orange and lemon growers. I have in mind an occasion, some three or four years since, when the poor sick people were famishing from thirst, dying with fever heat because there was no lemon, no lime to appease their thirst. Our philanthropic friends who represented the foreign steamship companies imported millions, and advanced the price from \$2 and \$3 until it reached \$8 a box. Some of our California orchardists had a few thousand boxes placed away in their storehouses, and they sent them into the market, and the fever patients were relieved by California coming to their rescue. They did it then and they will do it now, and I am on his side, for the people, in order that they may have cheap fruit and good fruit.

The trouble is that European countries have placed such a high duty upon citrus fruits that only the very best fruit is taken into

those countries, while the poor windfalls are sent into this country, carrying with them pestilence and disease frequently, for they are condemned by the quarantine officers and in many instances are thrown overboard.

Now as to the duty. I have made a corresponding table. I will not weary the Senate by going through all of its details, but taking the average price, in 1895 it was 35 per cent ad valorem on 1 cent a pound. In 1896, taking the average of the twelve months, it was 39½ per cent ad valorem. These figures are here in answer to a circular sent from New York, and I am prepared to verify them.

This duty is a small one, I will say to my friend the Senator from South Carolina, who had a letter read here. This is 39 per cent, and the other day I had the pleasure of voting for over 100 per cent on rice. I thought it was right. I want to protect South Carolina and all the other States against the cool labor that is sending rice into this country, but we want but 35 to 39 per cent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I trust that the rumor which has lately gained currency with respect to an island where coolies produce rice, that it is to be incorporated as a part of the American Republic, may prove to be somewhat of a canard.

I wish to say one word in reference to the circular read by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. The assertion that fruit would be injured by weighing is to me a novelty. If it is true in the United States, it must be true in France and England, and all the countries of Europe where duties are imposed upon this article, for everywhere they weigh the article. That is a complete answer to that statement.

Another thing. The same authority states that it will be great difficulty in finding the rotten fruit. They pay a duty now upon measuring the boxes. How do they find the rotten fruit by measuring the boxes? Can they not find it just as well if they weigh the boxes?

The packages that come in now are much wider in the middle than at either end. The measurement is usually made by a tape-line. The length of the box is measured, and the end of the box is measured, and in that way they bulge it a good deal on the revenue officials. Pound duty has been found, in other countries, to work well, and we are simply behind the times in trying to levy the duties as we have been doing in the past. As far as concerns this being an extreme duty, it is not. On the present price it will not exceed 45 per cent ad valorem.

I will say that in 1896 California packed 1,340,000 cases of fruit, and produced 84,000,000 pounds of raisins, 148,500,000 pounds of dried fruit, 51,000,000 pounds of prunes, and about 8,000 carloads of oranges. She also produced \$350,000 worth of nuts. There are 76,000 acres set out to oranges and 70,000 planted in prunes. Her lemon product in 1897 will aggregate about 1,000 carloads, at 280 boxes to the car, or 280,000 boxes, upon which the freight, at \$1.10 per box, equals \$308,000. The orange product for 1897 is 7,100 carloads, each car containing 336 boxes, or a total of 2,385,600 boxes, upon which the freight, at 90 cents per box, equals \$2,147,040, or an aggregate freight for oranges and lemons alone of about \$2,500,000. Riverside alone pays nearly \$700,000 in freight. It is within the figures to say that the freight rates annually paid by California upon green and dried fruits, including citrus fruits and prunes and raisins, approximate \$6,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I still believe there will be some difficulty of administration, as suggested by the gentleman's letter which I read. The delay in taking the fruit from the ships into the hands of the dealers of course always results in more or less injury to the fruit. The longer the delay is the greater the injury to the fruit. Unpacking and reexamining fruit in boxes must take a very great length of time, and it must be a very considerable annoyance. But I do not propose to discuss that point any further.

I understand perfectly well that this paragraph will remain in the bill, as the balance do. It will stay here exactly by the same force and the same power which has kept so many unjust things in the bill heretofore. But there is one other point I wish to call attention to before we leave this paragraph. I was struck with the providence of the majority of the Finance Committee when our attention was called by the Senator from Iowa to paragraph 535½ in the free list about the importation of fish. I wish to call particular attention to this, and the reason for this being done, and then I want to read a letter from a prominent citizen of the United States about the fruit business. The free paragraph as to fish says:

Fish, fresh, frozen, or packed in ice (except salmon), caught in the Great Lakes or other fresh waters—

Now, this is the part to which I wish you to pay particular attention—

by or for American fishermen or citizens of the United States.

There seems to be a desire there on the part of the committee to take care of the people of the United States even when they hire foreigners to catch pauper fish in outside waters. They are to be allowed to come into the United States free.

I have a letter, a very short one, written by Mr. J. A. Robertson, a gentleman well known to many members of the Senate perhaps, a gentleman of high character and high standing, whose statements will be accepted as true by everybody who knows him. It is written from Monterey, Mexico. The letter is short and explains itself:

First, presenting my apology for annoying you about a personal matter, but feeling that you do not wish to see an injustice done, I beg to explain that I am the owner of a large orange and fruit farm at Montemorelos, in this State. I have been engaged in this enterprise for about seven years, and my trees will come into bearing some this year and generally next year. Under the McKinley bill the duty on oranges was 25 cents per box of 2 cubic feet. Under the Wilson bill the duty was reduced to 20 cents per box—8 cents a cubic foot—and an ad valorem of 4 cents a box. The Dingley bill proposes a tariff of 20 cents a cubic foot, or 40 cents a box. Now, the California people are not yet satisfied and want their Senators to ask for a duty of 1 cent per pound, which would be about 75 cents per box, which does not seem very large for a single box, though it is equivalent to \$210 per car.

An orange grove in full bearing in California will produce from 4 to 5 boxes per tree, with 103 trees to an acre, being equivalent to from 400 to 425 boxes per acre, which makes a tariff in their favor of from \$275 to \$300 per acre annually, which is certainly unnecessary and uncalled for to properly protect their interest, particularly when the Mexican orange crop matures from ten to fourteen weeks earlier than their crop and at a time when there is no fruit of that character on the market.

Certainly it is not the policy of the American people to so favor any particular industry as to inflict a privation upon its citizens, and especially in protecting the fruit growers of California against a fruit that does not really enter into competition with them, but meets a requirement of the people at a time when they can not supply it.

The duty imposed in the McKinley bill was entirely fair and was satisfactory, and it was upon the strength of that duty that I began the extensive culture of oranges in this country which I have.

I submit these facts to you with the hope that they will in some way attract your sympathy and that the attention of the proper committee may be called to the matter in time to give it careful consideration before the bill is passed.

Anticipating your gracious compliance, I convey my thanks as well as those of the numerous other Americans who have engaged in a similar business here.

As I say, this comes from J. A. Robertson, a gentleman known to many of us. He states the case very clearly and so plainly that it does seem to me the committee, which is so careful to look after the interests even of the money of an American citizen when he hires a foreigner to catch foreign fish that it is provided that the fish shall be allowed to come in free, should present a provision by which this American citizen, who has put his money into the culture of oranges in Mexico, when he believed he understood what the law would be, should be protected against this exorbitant increase in a tax that is levied against him so as to keep his oranges out of the country at a time when there are no American oranges, practically, in the market.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The substitute was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 78, after line 15, to strike out paragraph 266 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

266. Orange peel or lemon peel, preserved, candied, or dried, and cocoanut meat or copra, desiccated, shredded, cut, or similarly prepared, 2 cents per pound; citron or citron peel, preserved, candied, or dried, 4 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 22, after the word "two," I move to insert "and one-half;" so as to read "2½ cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURROWS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this is an increase of one-half cent over the McKinley Act and from 30 per cent under existing law.

The reading of the bill was resumed, as follows:

267. Pineapples, in barrels and other packages, 6 cents per cubic foot; in bulk, \$6 per thousand.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I do not at present wish to move to amend the paragraph, although I may be compelled to do so later. The rate per cubic foot ought to be 15 cents instead of 6, to do justice to the agricultural interests of the only State in the nation that produces pineapples, and instead of \$6 per thousand it should be per pound just one-half the duty to be placed on Zante currants. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa in charge of the bill that the whole of this paragraph go over.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. VEST. Before it goes over, I wish to call attention to the fact that this is a horrible example of an increase over the McKinley Act. We were told that in no instance was it proposed in this bill to go over the McKinley rates. Pineapples under the McKinley Act were free, and 20 per cent was imposed under the Wilson Act, while in this paragraph the committee propose 6 cents a cubic foot and \$6 per 1,000.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that he, as one of the members of the Committee on Finance when the tariff bill of 1894 was being considered, thought proper to take pineapples from the free list and place them upon the dutiable list, in his charity to the State of Florida.

Mr. VEST. Nobody in the Senate knows better why that was done than the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. That is also possible.

Mr. VEST. He knows we were not free agents with respect to that bill as to a great many duties. With one majority in the Senate, we could not lose a fraction of a vote, and we were held up on a great many things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 268, line 4, page 79, before the word "cents," to strike out "five" and insert "three;" so as to read:

Nuts—

268. Almonds, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; clear almonds, shelled, 7 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to modify the amendment, in line 4, by inserting "4 cents" instead of "3 cents;" and in line 5 by inserting "6 cents" instead of "7 cents;" so as to read:

268. Almonds, not shelled, 4 cents per pound; clear almonds, shelled, 6 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The impression has gone out all over the country that the Senate committee, in reporting the Dingley bill, so called, from the committee, intended materially to reduce what seemed to be extravagantly high rates in that measure. I confess I am astonished that whenever we reach in this bill a proposition to carry out one of the committee amendments the committee proposes at once to recede and to accept and stand by the rates that came in the Dingley bill. It seems to me that it would have been better, if the majority of the committee intended to take the Dingley bill as it came from the House, to have reported it to the Senate in that way and to have stood by it, so as to let the Senate and the country understand that they intended to take the high rates of the Dingley bill from the beginning, and not make any pretense of making reductions in these paragraphs, upon which we have been led to believe there were going to be material reductions from the Dingley bill.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Arkansas does not understand the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I thought I did.

Mr. ALLISON. The amendment proposed is 4 cents, where the rate in the House bill is 5 cents.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator proposes to strike out "three," as first reported, and to insert "four."

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; but the bill as it came from the House reads "5 cents."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I thought perhaps the Senator did not want to do the whole thing in one amendment, but that before we would leave the paragraph the Senator would make the other change.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator is right about the first proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 79, paragraph 269, line 6, after the word "shelled," to strike out "three" and insert "two and one-half;" and in line 8, before the word "cents," to strike out "six" and insert "five;" so as to make the paragraph read:

269. Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 2½ cents per pound; shelled, 5 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 270, page 79, line 10, before the words "one cent," to insert "one-half of;" and in line 11, before the words "per pound," to strike out "and one-half cents" and insert "cent;" so as to make the paragraph read:

270. Peanuts or ground beans, unshelled, one-half of 1 cent per pound; shelled, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. VEST. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that of peanuts unshelled we imported, in 1896, \$2,359,000 worth, and of peanuts shelled we imported \$4.24 worth. I suppose that this increase of duty is for the purpose of protecting the peanut growers from the \$4.24 worth imported from abroad.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 271, page 79, line 13, after the word "one," to strike out "and one-half cents" and insert "cent;" so as to make the paragraph read:

271. Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read as follows:

Meat products:

272. Bacon and hams, 5 cents per pound.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out "5 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

Here is a conspicuous example of protection to the American farmer which must not pass unnoticed. We exported in 1896 to foreign countries from the United States \$33,442,847 worth of bacon and \$12,669,763 worth of hams. We imported of bacon and hams \$44,906 worth, that amount coming in the shape of the Westphalia hams, which are very much prized by epicures and are sold in the first-class hotels and restaurants of New York. Here is an object lesson which, as a matter of course, will go for nothing: \$33,442,847 worth of bacon, \$12,669,763 worth of hams, making \$46,000,000 of bacon and hams, are sent from this country abroad, and we increase the duty in order to protect the American producer of bacon and hams from \$44,906 worth, which come in as fancy hams from the Continent of Europe; yet I have no doubt my Republican friends will go to the farmers and say, "We, we saved you from an influx of bacon and hams. We saved your bacon against the pauper hogs of Europe;" and the Republican partisans and affectionately caresses the bacon and ham makers of the United States.

I ask for a vote on the amendment which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 272, page 79, line 16, strike out "5 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem;" so as to read:

Bacon and hams, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 273, page 79, line 17, before the word "mutton," to strike out "Beef" and insert "Fresh beef, veal;" so as to make the paragraph read:

273. Fresh beef, veal, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "2 cents per pound" and insert "20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. VEST. Now I want to complete the object lesson. In 1896 we exported from this country of foreign pork \$43,739 worth and imported \$1,560 worth. We exported of pickled pork \$3,172,461 worth and imported \$118,000 worth. We exported of fresh beef \$18,974,107 and imported \$24,569 worth. We exported in 1896 of canned beef \$59,371 worth, and we imported of all these, beef, veal, etc., \$9,685 worth. Notwithstanding the enormous exports and the inconsiderable imports, we are now protecting the American beef and pork industry in the way indicated in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

274. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "ten;" so as to make the duty 10 per cent ad valorem, which is the present rate.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to insert the following as a new paragraph:

274. Dead game, and game meats, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

275. Extract of meat, not specially provided for in this act, 35 cents per pound; fluid extract of meat, 15 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have that paragraph passed over.

Mr. ALLISON. I propose to amend it so as to perfect it. However, I understand the Senator from Arkansas desires to have the paragraph go over, and I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa proposes an amendment to the paragraph, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of paragraph 275, page 79, line 25, the following:

But the dutiable weight of the extract of meat and of the fluid extract of meat shall not include the weight of the package in which the same is imported.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is a very great improvement, but I should like to have the paragraph go over for the present.

Mr. ALLISON. Is there any objection to this amendment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There is no objection to the amendment. I think it is right.

Mr. ALLISON. Then let the amendment be agreed to, and the paragraph be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to, and the paragraph will be passed over.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

276. Lard, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. VEST. I move to reduce the rate from 2 cents to 1 cent a pound. I ask the Secretary to read an official report by Worth-

ington C. Ford, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. Read the heading and down to the subhead "Tallow."

The Secretary read as follows:

EXPORTS OF LARD, ETC., FOR FEBRUARY.

Worthington C. Ford, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, submits the following statement of the exports of lard, tallow, oleo oil, and oleomargarine from the United States during the month of February, 1897:

LARD.

	Pounds.	Value.
February, 1897	41,941,190	\$2,063,040
February, 1896	25,631,103	1,789,607
Eight months ending February, 1897	328,037,983	16,898,314
Eight months ending February, 1896	335,153,134	23,171,715

Mr. VEST. In view of those figures, I should like to have a reply to one question. I expect no satisfactory reply. Why should we double the duty upon this article when we export that enormous amount after supplying the home market? Is it to be pretended that this is any protection to the American producer? Is it to be pretended that any protection is necessary under the circumstances? It shows what a miserable farce this has degenerated into. I suppose the purpose is to furnish a campaign argument to the raisers of hogs in the West and South.

Our friends upon the other side vastly depreciate the intelligence of our people if they think that this will be looked upon in any other light than the master of the grange from Pennsylvania viewed it in his testimony, which I read the other day, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, when he said it was an insult to the intelligence of the farmers of this country to attempt to make them believe that when they made enormous exports of an article an increase of the tariff duty was in their interest. Here is an unparalleled exportation of this article, and when we are the great exporting country of the world, here the duty is increased 100 per cent, and the farmers are expected to believe that it is done for the purpose of protecting them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

277. Poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dressed, 5 cents per pound.

The next paragraph was read, as follows:

278. Tallow, 1 cent per pound; wool grease, including that known commercially as degrass or brown wool grease, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Secretary to read the official report of Mr. Ford as to tallow.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask that paragraph 278 be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio asks that the paragraph be passed over.

Mr. ALLISON. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the paragraph is passed over.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, under the heading "Miscellaneous products," in paragraph 279, page 80, line 8, after the word "Chicory-root," to strike out "raw, dried, or undried, but unground, 1 cent per pound; chicory-root;" and in line 12, after the word "act," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" so as to make the paragraph read:

279. Chicory-root, burnt or roasted, ground or granulated, or in rolls, or otherwise prepared, and not specially provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the first amendment of the committee be disregarded to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the first amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. And the second amendment—

Mr. VEST. Let us understand the effect of that.

Mr. ALLISON. In behalf of the committee, I modify the amendment in line 12 by inserting after the word "two" the words "and one-half;" so as to read "2½ cents a pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment as modified will be agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. And thereby you raise the rate higher than under the McKinley Act, or higher than the Dingley bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Not so high as the Dingley bill.

Mr. VEST. Higher than the McKinley Act.

Mr. ALLISON. We are steering under the House provision in this paragraph at least, but it seemed to me that we had reduced the duty a little too low on the prepared article.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator if this article, chicory, is used for any other purpose than to adulterate coffee?

Mr. ALLISON. I believe it is a substitute and an adulterant as well. It improves coffee, I am told. I think it can bear a revenue duty.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand it is a practical fraud, and that the purpose is to enable grocers who choose to do so to

mix a cheaper stuff with coffee and to sell it as coffee rather than to sell the coffee itself.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator want to raise the duty in order to prevent its importation?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I confess I am somewhat at a loss to know just how it should be treated.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it should be 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not see why we should undertake to promote the development of a domestic fraud, and I am not particularly anxious to confer any favors on a foreign fraud. It seems to me that the thing is a fraud from end to end.

Mr. ALLISON. Between the difficulties in the way, I think we can compromise upon 2½ cents a pound on prepared chicory, and whatever the result, our own people—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Is that for the purpose of protection?

Mr. ALLISON. For protection and revenue.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to state to the Senator from Arkansas, in view of his remark that this is a fraud, that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] would take occasion, if he were present, to controvert that statement at great length.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope he will not do that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator from New Hampshire is familiar with the opinions of the Senator from Nebraska on the subject, perhaps he will favor the Senate now by stating what those opinions are.

Mr. CHANDLER. I can make the statement shorter than the Senator from Nebraska would do if he were here. He gave me a fine package of chicory, made and prepared as a product of his own State, and said that he thinks it is as much entitled to protection as anything that is contained in the bill. He omitted to say that he should vote for a duty upon anything else besides chicory, but I think, perhaps, he would object if he were here; at any rate, I know he would speak at great length, if he were here, on account of the remark which the Senator from Arkansas has made, that the protection of chicory, a native product of great value in Nebraska, is a fraud.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator from New Hampshire seems strangely to misunderstand what I said. I did not say that the protection of chicory is a fraud; I do not think that I said that the use of chicory is a fraud. I said that such was my understanding. I should be glad to have the Senator explain to the Senate now, as he seems to be an expert on the subject, if the sole purpose of the production of chicory is not to adulterate coffee?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am joining now with the Senator from Arkansas in reducing the duty on the products, and therefore it is not pertinent—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. What is the Senator's theory in wanting the duty reduced? I am seeking light.

Mr. CHANDLER. Therefore it is not pertinent to ask me whether it is a fraud. But I think I will answer the Senator's question briefly. I do not understand chicory to be prepared for purposes of adulteration. I understand that as it is now prepared in Nebraska and sold as a cheap product it is to be used alone and without coffee.

Mr. FORAKER. As a substitute for coffee.

Mr. CHANDLER. As a substitute for coffee. If anybody chooses to mix it with coffee, no one will find any fault, any more than if a Southern gentleman mixes his drinks occasionally.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator be kind enough to state whether he ever saw a cup of chicory unmixed with coffee or ever heard of anything of that sort practically?

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, yes; I have heard of it from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My own impression was that it was used only for the purpose of adulterating coffee, and it was for that reason that I did not think it deserved any particular fostering care at the hands of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, one word, in order not to place the absent Senator from Nebraska in a wrong position. I understand that he is very anxious to have this duty, but does not want it as a protective duty; he insists upon it as a revenue duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, including the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was to strike out the following paragraph:

280. Chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for, valued at not above 12 cents per pound, 14 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 12 cents per pound and not above 24 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; valued above 24 cents per pound and not above 35 cents per pound, 3 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; valued above 35 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; powdered cocoa, unsweetened, 5 cents per pound; and when packed in cans or packages made of tin or other metal, not exceeding 1 pound each in contents, an additional duty of 6 cents per dozen cans or packages; and when exceeding 1 pound, an additional duty of 3 cents per dozen for additional half pound or fraction thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

280. Chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this act, valued at not above 15 cents per pound, 2 cents per pound; valued above 15 and not above 25 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 25 and not above 40 cents per pound, 5 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 40 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem. The weight of the immediate coverings, other than the outer packing case or other covering, shall be included in the dutiable weight of the merchandise.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire, on behalf of the committee, to propose a modification of the substitute which is embraced in lines 8 to 21, inclusive. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that this has been very carefully prepared by the experts at the Treasury Department, and that it does not essentially change the duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

280. Chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this act, valued at not over 15 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound; valued above 15 and not above 24 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 24 and not above 35 cents per pound, 5 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued above 35 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem. The weight and value of all coverings, other than plain wooden, shall be included in the dutiable weight and value of the foregoing merchandise. Powdered cocoa, unsweetened, 5 cents per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. VEST. There is objection, and very decided objection. This is manifestly an increase upon the amendment proposed by the majority of the committee. In the comparative statement, Mr. Ford estimates, by the amendment prior to this last one, an increase over the Wilson Act or the existing law from 11 per cent to 24 per cent, and in the higher grades from 35 per cent to 50 per cent. As I caught the reading of the last proposed amendment, it is unquestionably an increase over those figures, and I should like to know from the Senator—

Mr. ALLISON. It is a slight increase at the valuation of 35 cents rather than 40 cents.

Mr. VEST. I seriously object to this duty, but of course I do not expect what I say will have any effect upon the Senate. Here is an article which is one of food, a necessity to the American people, and unquestionably it is not necessary to protect any American industry. The duty as proposed in the original amendment was excessive. I should like to ask the Senator what new light has caused him to propose this increase now?

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator that the modifications of this paragraph were made after consultation, I may say, with those who import this article and those who manufacture it here, and it is better to equalize the different grades or brackets in the paragraph that the modifications were suggested. The general scope of the amendment is in accordance with the provision of the House, and in accordance with our original provision, except that we have reduced below the House provision in both our amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, modifying the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 281, page 81, line 22, after the word "cocoa-butterine," to strike out "six" and insert "three and one-half;" so as to make the paragraph read:

281. Cocoa-butter or cocoa-butterine, 3½ cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 282, page 81, line 24, after the word "and," to strike out "other;" and on page 82, line 2, after the word "act," to strike out "one and one-half" and insert "two;" so as to make the paragraph read:

282. Dandelion-root and acorns prepared, and articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee, not specially provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask leave to modify the amendment by inserting "and one-half" after "two," so as to make these other substitutes for coffee accord with the provision already made respecting chicory.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator will explain to the Senate why it is necessary to raise the tax on acorns some 100 per cent higher than was proposed even in the Dingley bill. Is it possible that pauper acorns from abroad are going to exterminate American acorns?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator understands, I think—I hope he does—that this is a provision relating wholly to substitutes for coffee not specially provided for in this act, and the duty is upon prepared substitutes for coffee. If acorns are thus prepared, I do not see why they should not pay a fair revenue as well as chicory.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My understanding is that acorns are used for other purposes besides.

Mr. ALLISON. Not those mentioned in this paragraph. It reads, "Dandelion-root and acorns prepared, and articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee not specially provided for in this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

283. Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 12 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 8 cents per 100 pounds: *Provided*, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries, and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than \$100.

Mr. VEST. I remarked the other day that whilst there were many features in the tariff act of 1894 to which I seriously objected, but was compelled to accept in order to pass any bill at all, there were four features in that bill which reconciled me to those that were objectionable. Those features were the income tax, free salt, free lumber, and free wool. It was attempted to put a duty on wool. Much as I desired to pass some tariff bill in order that the party to which I belong should not be discredited and accused of inefficiency, I peremptorily declared in committee and in the Senate that if a duty was put upon wool I should vote against the bill. We have already taken lumber off the free list and put a duty upon it. I take it for granted that we shall put this duty on salt, and I have no doubt that we shall put what I consider an outrageous and excessive duty upon wool.

Nothing can better illustrate the protective system than the utter disregard of the interests of the immense masses of the consumers of the country in order to put additional profits into the pockets of certain classes. My illustrious predecessor in this Chamber, Thomas H. Benton, was in the habit of saying here and to his constituents that salt was the great preservative of nature. It is like the air we breathe, like the water that leaps down the mountain side and flows through the valleys without asking leave; yet with \$130,000,000 of surplus in the Treasury, I am told that Democrats who have always preached the doctrine of a tariff not one cent above the expenses of the Government economically and honestly administered are prepared now to put a duty on salt against all the legends, traditions, teachings, and appeals of the great leaders of our party in all the past.

Mr. President, I have here a pamphlet showing why salt should remain upon the free list. It comes from the section which we have been notified will support a duty upon salt. I have here a statement signed by hundreds of the leading citizens, merchants and others, in New Orleans; in Monroe, La.; in Shreveport, La.; in Onachita, La.; in Natchez, Miss.; in Kosciusko, Miss.; in Jackson, Miss.; in Macon, Miss.; in Yazoo City, Miss.; in Vicksburg, Miss.; in Crystal Springs, Miss.; in Greenwood, Miss.; in Monticello, Miss.; in Wesson, Miss.; in Durant, Miss.; in Holly Springs, Miss., and in a number of other places in the South, protesting against putting this duty upon salt.

I want to call attention to the sectionalism of this provision. While the fisherman of New England is entitled to a rebate upon all the foreign salt he uses in curing his fish, without limitation as to the amount, the meat grower of the West and South must produce \$100 worth of meat or pack \$100 worth of meat before he secures any rebate at all. Why this limitation put upon one section and not upon the other? It shows, Mr. President, that whilst it is pretended that there is no sectionalism in this bill, and the advent of Southern Senators to the cause of protection is hailed with more enthusiasm than when a soul is saved at a camp meeting, the whole thing is a pretense; and we always find the cloven foot of class legislation showing itself when the opportunity presents.

Out of respect to these gentlemen, many of whom I know personally in New Orleans and in Shreveport, where I formerly lived, I ask that the Secretary read that argument coming from citizens of the South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary proceeded to read the paper referred to, but before concluding was interrupted by

Mr. VEST. I will ask that the entire paper be printed in the RECORD, without being further read, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

The paper referred to is as follows:

SALT SHOULD NOT BE TAXED.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., June 1, 1897.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully beg to submit a short argument on the question as to whether salt should remain on the free list as it now is or go into the tariff as a dutiable item.

There is now pending before your honorable body a measure the title of which is "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States." In this proposed act, under the head

of Schedule G, we find an item reading as follows: "Salt, in sacks or other packages, 12 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 8 cents per 100 pounds."

As stated in this act, the first object to be accomplished is to provide revenue. Should salt be placed on the dutiable list at this time, would it prove to be a satisfactory revenue producer? Judging by the recent past, when salt was dutiable, we contend that salt will not produce sufficient revenue to pay for its collection. Let us go back and review the facts. The war tariff enacted in 1862 was repealed in 1872. In making the new tariff of the latter year, instead of placing salt on the free list, it was included as a dutiable item, the rate being fixed (the same as is now proposed) at 12 cents per 100 pounds if in sacks, and 8 cents per 100 pounds if in bulk, which was equivalent to an ad valorem tax of 50 per cent. This was evidently a disappointment to the importers, for soon after the enactment of this tariff there began to appear in the annual reports compiled and published by the Government a perceptible falling off in the imports of salt; and with the exception of three or four years this continued while salt remained subject to a duty.

In confirmation of the above, we submit the following extract from official returns: The total dutiable value of the salt imported in 1874 was \$2,102,000; while in 1879, five years later, it was but \$1,635,200; in 1884, ten years after, it was only \$1,527,500; and in fifteen years (1889) it was only \$466,700; in 1893 it was but \$622,593; and in 1894 it had shrunk to a total of but \$453,283, a shrinkage in values of imported salt of 77 per cent in twenty years.

The above refers not to the duties collected on salt, to which we will refer later, but is the yearly total value of all the imported salt which paid duty, said value being compiled by the Government.

The dutiable values were low, and there was but little fluctuations during the first fifteen or sixteen years—say to 1889—and were higher during the last four or five years; therefore the above, being a conservative statement, is also, we consider, a correct one.

Had the Government persisted in maintaining the excessively high duty then prevailing (and the identical rate is inserted in the pending bill), is it not evident that inside of five or six years the importations of salt would have ceased entirely? This did not happen. The importations fell off (as did the annual revenue derived from the duty on salt grow less and less) until, in 1893 and 1894, the receipts from this item were so small as to attract the attention of Congress, which then very wisely placed salt on the free list, where it should have been and where it should always remain.

Let us ascertain just what kind of a revenue producer salt proved to be during the last decade it was serving as a dutiable item.

The following, taken from the official statistics of the Government, shows, for the fiscal year ending June 30, the gross annual amount of revenue collected by the Government from the duty on salt from 1884 to 1894, inclusive:

1884.....	\$762,201	1890.....	\$394,215
1885.....	751,390	1891.....	408,789
1886.....	706,324	1892.....	329,143
1887.....	676,865	1893.....	301,972
1888.....	552,693	1894.....	229,803
1889.....	469,435		

It will be noted in the five years from 1884 to 1889 the falling off in revenue to the Government was nearly 40 per cent; in nine years it was over 60 per cent, and in ten years (1894) the Government's revenue had shrunk 70 per cent. It must be remembered that while under a special proviso, inserted in the tariff act, the Eastern fisheries were allowed to withdraw their salt from the bonded warehouses free of duty, the same is not considered in the above, nor has any deduction been made for the refunds under the same proviso allowed to the numerous large packers of meat in the West, whose foreign salt exclusively in preparing their products for exportation. While we do not know the amounts of these refunds, they must be considerable, and they tend to materially reduce the above very small annual revenue, which, as we have stated, are the gross receipts of the Government, it being absolutely necessary that while salt is included in the tariff the Government incurs the same care and expense in keeping records, checking, weighing, etc., in the case of these imports the duty on which is rebated as if they were paying a duty like the balance of the imported salt.

Looking at the pitiful amount of revenue indicated above, collected by the officials of the customs service employed on our thousands of miles of seacoast from Maine to Mexico and from Washington to Lower California, for the twelve months ending June 30, 1894, and again for the years ending June 30, 1892 and 1893, when there was no change anticipated in the tariff nor agitation about the duties on salt, we confidently assert that (after allowing for the rebates to be deducted therefrom) the net amount of these collections were not sufficient to reimburse the Government the cost of collection.

Though making every effort to ascertain the yearly amount of the duty paid back by the Government under the proviso, it was not, we regret, until after writing the above that we succeeded in securing some information prepared by the customs service, which, having a direct bearing on the case, and though incomplete, is, we consider, of sufficient importance to submit with this argument.

The following amounts were paid back to the exporters of meat who had used imported salt in curing same. Only nine of the customs districts are given, amounts paid out being as follows: 1889, \$56,438; 1890, \$71,049; 1891, \$75,145; 1892, \$73,856; 1893, \$73,972.

This left the receipts of duty on salt for same years as follows: 1889, \$412,997; 1890, \$223,166; 1891, \$333,644; 1892, \$255,287; 1893, \$228,000.

We have not the amount of the drawback for 1891, but the average for the five previous years is just \$70,000, and as the system was the same for that fiscal year as had been maintained since 1872, no doubt the average was maintained that year. Making the allowance, we find the gross revenue on salt, as near as can be ascertained, was the very insignificant sum of \$159,803.

These facts clearly show that, if placed on the dutiable list again, salt would not be a satisfactory revenue producer.

The second object to be accomplished, as stated in the pending act, is "to encourage the industries of the United States." We contend that the makers of salt in this country no longer need encouragement; having for so many years dominated the salt trade and dictated prices in the United States, they could without protection successfully cope with the imported article. Through favorable tariff enactments these manufacturers have been protected and encouraged for more than three-quarters of a century (the infant developing meantime into a robust industry), growing stronger and stronger, until in later years, finding no foe from without worthy of attention, they went to competing among themselves, and when a salt works was compelled to close, investigation invariably proved it was forced out of business by its neighbor, and not because of competition with foreign salt.

As evidence of this we submit the following abstract, taken from the statement of the mineral resources of the United States for the calendar year 1892, compiled by the Department of the Interior: "The amount of salt produced in the United States in 1892 was unprecedentedly large, reaching 11,638,890 barrels of 280 pounds, as against 9,987,945 in 1891. Although the yield was the largest yet obtained, the business was not by any means satisfactory to producers. Sharp competition for trade during the past two years (1891 and 1892) has cut the prices to such low figures that profits have almost disappeared and a number of the smaller concerns have been compelled to close their works. No more conclusive evidence of the improvement in the quality of the domestic salt is necessary than a study of the table imports, which show a steady decrease since 1885. The total value of the salt imported into

the United States in 1892 was nearly 50 per cent less than in 1885." The following extracts are also taken from statement of the same Department for the year 1893: "The salt product of the United States in 1893 was 117,882 barrels more than in 1892; prices ruling for 1892 were about as low as they could reach, so low indeed that a number of manufacturers ceased producing, though they were protected and encouraged by the heavy duty on foreign salt, finding the business unprofitable. Notwithstanding the low prices which have prevailed, and which have been due to keen competition among producers of domestic salt, there has been a laudable endeavor on the part of a number of domestic manufacturers to improve the quality of their product, and salt of American manufacture has been so improved by new processes that importation of refined (foreign) salt has almost ceased to be a factor."

The same authority in the statement for year 1894, published in 1895, says: "Imports of foreign salt into the United States have shown an almost constant decrease since 1881, the decrease being particularly noticeable in the imports of refined salt due to the improvements in the manufacture by American producers which has placed the domestic product on a line with if not ahead of salts of foreign make."

We call attention to the last assertion: "The improvement in the manufacture by American producers has placed the domestic product on a line with if not ahead of salts of foreign make."

The statement from which the above extract was taken was written by an expert compiler, one equipped with the necessary knowledge acquired after many years' experience at such work, who was therefore in a position to know whereof he wrote; his conclusions, being indorsed by the chief of division, were also approved by the director of the Bureau, therefore being the conclusion of three of the most expert statisticians and compilers in the employ of the Government.

While the last statement was for the year ending December 31, 1894, it was compiled early in 1895, when foreign salt was not being excluded from the United States by a heavy duty, and the official announcement at such a time that "salt of domestic production was equal in quality if not superior to foreign make" is conclusive evidence that the salt industry had reached such a stage of superabundance of quantity (note amount of annual output) as well as perfection in quality as to no longer need encouragement and protection.

An impost duty was first placed on salt in July, 1789. During the 105 years following, to August 28, 1894, salt was on the free list for twenty-four years and dutiable for eighty-one years. In 1861 the rate was made very high, equal to about 75 per cent ad valorem, followed shortly after, in 1862, by a still higher rate, equaling 100 per cent ad valorem. This continued until 1872, when it was reduced to a rate equal to 50 per cent ad valorem. Here is an industry protected and encouraged for over eighty years, the last thirty-three years being consecutive, during all of which time our people have been heavily taxed on an article of absolute necessity to man and beast—an article used in many of the manufactures and in all food and food products. Carrying such a heavy tax for so many years, it is natural to suppose that great benefit was being derived by a large number of people and that many thousands of laborers found employment in the numerous salt works. What do the records show?

If we take the census of 1880, we will learn there were 276 establishments manufacturing salt in the United States, a capital investment of \$8,500,000, with a total of 4,493 employees, who were paid \$1,305,020 in wages annually, each laborer averaging \$290 per year, or \$24.16 per month, which is just 80 cents per day. The census of 1890 shows there were only 200 establishments, with a capital of \$13,437,749, a total of 4,455 employees, less than 23 people, including manager, clerks, and laborers, to each salt works, whose annual wages, \$1,782,491, an average of \$400.11 to each employee per year, or \$33.34 per month, or \$1.10 per day.

It having been shown that collections from the duty on salt, owing to the prohibitory rate, were so small that the Government could not longer derive benefit therefrom, the question naturally arises, Who would be benefited by a tax levied on 71,000,000 people? Would it be a great army of laborers at liberal pay, or the [less than] 4,500 employees receiving the extravagant compensation in return for their labor of from 80 cents to \$1.10 per day? No; the sole beneficiaries would be the few proprietors of the salt works, whose already enormous profits would be thereby increased.

For though salt is just as necessary to the well-being of all as is air or water, our people would be compelled to pay an advanced price on the salt they used, because to the regular profit in the selling price of the domestic article there would be added an amount equal to the duty paid on the imported salt, therefore the cost to the consumer would be increased to that extent.

When salt is again made dutiable, and thus added to the list of articles which it is claimed need encouragement, these beneficiaries will be encouraged to again take up and continue the concentration of capital and the consolidation of works. While the total capital invested in works in 1880 was but eight and one-half million dollars, in 1890 it was thirteen and one-half million dollars, but the number of establishments was decreased from 276 in 1880 to 200 in 1890, and further reduced to less than 160 in 1894, and this while the proprietors of these salt works were being protected and encouraged by the then existing heavy duty on all foreign salt. It was just eight years since, in June, 1889, that an effort at combination was made to form a salt union of all the makers in the United States by the formation of a company with a capital of \$15,000,000. This union had option on all the establishments whose output was seven-eighths of all the salt produced in America, and it was principally because the few remaining establishments could not be secured, except at exorbitant prices, that the combination fell through. Who can predict that, salt being again made dutiable, the next attempt at combination will not be successful?

The following tabulated statement shows the total imports of all kinds of foreign salt and the total production of American salt from 1884 to 1894, inclusive, on basis of 2,000 pounds to the ton in both cases:

Year.	Total imported.	Total production of American salt.	Year.	Total imported.	Total production of American salt.
	Tons.	Tons.		Tons.	Tons.
1884	466,297	912,091	1890	246,837	1,228,779
1885	415,000	985,411	1891	239,217	1,398,312
1886	408,983	1,078,991	1892	235,075	1,637,845
1887	350,959	1,120,554	1893	195,983	1,665,609
1888	330,097	1,127,823	1894	172,739	1,815,438
1889	270,271	1,120,779			

We call attention to and request your careful consideration of the above, which was compiled for the period (the eleven years) immediately preceding the removal of the duty on salt. It clearly shows the effect the almost prohibitory duty was having. While the output of the American establishments was steadily increasing each year, the importations were as surely decreasing, being steadily driven from the market and out of competition, until, of the total amount of salt consumed in 1894, there were sold 172,739 tons of (2,000 pounds each) imported salt, which was only 9 per cent of the total consumption of this country for that year, 91 per cent being supplied by the American manufacturers.

While shrinkage in importation of the foreign salt amounted to 62 per cent during the eleven years, the increase in production of the American salt amounted to nearly 100 per cent in the same time.

How was it that during these eleven years the selling price of the American salt fell over 40 per cent, in spite of the protection afforded by a heavy duty? It certainly can not be claimed that this was due to foreign competition. The facts are, and can not be denied, that under the stimulus of a high duty, almost prohibitory, the domestic manufacture has been steadily growing—in fact, has been suffering from overproduction induced by excessive protection.

The proprietors of the American Salt Works late in 1893 and in 1894 predicted dire disaster and ruin to their business and a great falling off in the amount of the production should the duty on salt then prevailing be taken off. The contrary has proven to be the case, for their output for 1895, when salt was free, was 98,313 tons more than in 1894, when salt was dutiable, the total amount of the output of the American Works for 1895 being 1,913,751 tons, and there were 248,404 tons of foreign imported, which was less than 12 per cent of the total amount consumed during this year, when salt was free, and to exclude this insignificant competition Congress is asked to put a heavy duty on salt.

Respectfully submitted.

JACKSON & KILPATRICK,
New Orleans, La.

COPY OF PETITION AGAINST DUTY ON SALT.

[Original petition in the possession of Finance Committee of the United States Senate, Washington.]

The undersigned importers, exporters, ship agents, merchants, and consumers of salt at the port of New Orleans, La., and vicinity, respectfully submit for your careful consideration the following appeal against the placing of salt on the dutiable list.

Steamships coming to this port from Liverpool for cargoes of our products, such as cotton, cotton-seed oil, oil cake, lumber, staves, etc., bring salt. This salt, besides being a desirable cargo, always pays freight, thus contributing toward the cost of bringing steamers here, and to that extent permitting of a material reduction in the rate of freight on all outward cargoes of our American products which go to seek a market abroad.

On the other hand, should the importation of salt be prohibited, owing to the imposition of an excessively high duty, as now proposed, many of these steamers would be compelled to come in purchased ballast, and thus our exports, under such circumstance, would necessarily have to pay a higher freight, one sufficient to compensate steamer for the entire round trip.

Official statistics published by our Government show that of the total amount of salt consumed in the United States during 1895, more than 87 per cent was produced in this country, and though salt was then free of duty, less than 13 per cent was imported.

We submit, if a duty is levied on salt, it will be solely for the purpose of preventing this insignificant competition, and if the importations did not cease entirely, they would be so infinitesimally small the Government would not collect enough revenue from this item in the tariff to compensate for the cost of collecting same.

The rate now proposed (12 cents per 100 pounds on all salt in sacks and 8 cents per 100 pounds on all salt in bulk) would undoubtedly result in practically excluding all importations of salt.

We can not believe the advancement of our American industries is best secured by means of a prohibitory tariff that may result in such retaliatory tariffs by other countries as would discriminate against the products of the farms and factories of the United States.

NEW ORLEANS, April, 1897.

New Orleans, La.: Jackson & Kilpatrick, importers; B. H. Flash-poller & Sons, E. Feibleman, Sons & Co., Jno. M. Parker & Co., Berkson Bros., C. Doyle & Co., H. T. Cottam Company, Limited, J. & B. Schutten, J. & M. Schwabacher Company, Limited, Fly Hobson & Talbert, V. Schwan & Co., and The Ledoux Company, Limited, wholesale grocers; Andrew J. McShane and Kuebel & Raquet, wholesale hides and wool; The Finnegan, Fitzpatrick Company, wholesale dealer hides and wool and exporters; J. H. Menge & Sons, Limited (per B. H. Menge, president), wholesale grocers and ship chandlers, etc.; H. B. Schreiber & Bro. and John T. Gibbons, wholesale grain dealers; H. & S. Blum, produce merchants; Albert Mackie Grocery Company, Limited (per Albert Mackie, president), Preston & Stauffer, and J. G. Spor, produce grocers; Smith Bros. Company, Limited (per J. B. Sinnott, president and manager), wholesale grocers and importers; Codifer Exterstein & Co. (per Hy. Exterstein, secretary), wholesale grocers and importers; American Brewing Company (Frank Beck, secretary); Lawrence Fabacher & Bros., restaurant; Clark & Meader, grocers and importers; A. Dumser & Co., importers; Nicholas Burke Company, Limited, wholesale grocers; E. S. Reems, wholesale grocers; Barnett & Lemle, H. R. Gogrove, Andrew J. Keenan, and H. Hammett, wholesale grocers; Wm. Mehle, exporter and dealer in hides and wool; A. G. Ricks, New Orleans Brewing Association; E. Conery & Son, Limited, wholesale grocers, ship and boat stores; Chas. Gitzinger, grain dealers; Louis Pfister, Poydras and Magazine streets; J. H. Keller, soap works (per Hy. Haag, secretary and treasurer); G. W. Dunbar & Sons, packers; Wm. Atkinson, commission; M. J. Sanders, agent West India and Pacific Steamship Company; Alfred Le Blanc, agent Harrison Line Steamship Company; Elder Dempster Company, per M. R. Warriner, agent Elder Dempster Line steamers; A. B. French & Co., Melletta & Stoddart, and Corral & Sevilla, ship agents; Chas. D. Orthwein & Sons, grain exporters; Francis Xigues & Co., exporters of staves; Macheca Bros., steamship owners; A. K. Miller & Co. and S. V. Fornaris & Co., steamship agents; Bobet Bros. and Jno. J. Gragard, stave exporters; W. J. Hammond, agent Hammond & Sunett Steamship Company; Simon Kern and Max Lowry, stave exporters.

Monroe, La.: Meyer Bros., T. G. Reiley, R. L. Proppit, James C. Weeks, Moses Elder Company, Limited, J. W. Carlton, Southern Grocery Company, Limited, McCormick & Fluker, T. O. Brewer & Co., E. Fudickar, W. B. Reidy, J. J. Jordan, and Uriah Millsaps, wholesale grocers; Consolidated Ice Company; D. A. Breard, jr., president Ouachita National Bank; J. S. Handy, president Monroe Grocery Company; W. C. Hilliard, president Monroe Hardware Company; R. B. Blanks, president Merchants and Farmers' Bank; John D. Painter, president Planters' Oil Company.

Ouachita City, La.: J. A. Peck, merchant.

Kentwood, La.: Banner Lumber Company.

Shreveport, La.: The Hicks Company, Limited, W. B. Ogilvie, W. F. Taylor, Hunter Bros., Ardis & Co., and Crawford, Jenkins & Booth, wholesale grocers.

Natchez, Miss.: Rumble & Wensel Company, S. Geisenberger, C. G. Miller, E. B. Foster, P. Burns, Adolph Jacobs, P. Sanguinetta, A. F. Jacobs & Bro., Stockman Grocery Company, W. H. Pritchard & Co., Chas. Zerkowsky, Dreyfus Mercantile Company, Postlethwaite & Chase, Charles Meeks, R. Vigner & Co., M. E. Peelesta, E. J. Byrne, Frank Tudoree, B. Kullman, A. Beer & Co., Frank Howe, I. Lowenburg & Co., Wm. James, Perrault & Maher, Julius W. Roos, David Laub, R. J. Thompson, A. J. Smith, Miller & Ruoff, The Mallory Grocery Company (by D. S. Bisland, treasurer), and Chas. H. Scheile, merchants.

Kosciusko, Miss.: W. B. Potas Company, S. Abraham & Co., S. P. Kissimer, W. A. Stingly, L. B. Rosenthal, J. H. Collier, J. Miles Boyd, C. B. Gregory, Wm. Shanks, Du Bard & Smith, G. W. Smith, P. S. Edmonds, J. N. Alexander, W. A. Gilliland & Co., A. E. Kelly, W. G. Boswell, and W. J. Brown Bros. & Co., merchants.

Jackson, Miss.: W. W. Morrison, R. M. McElroy, A. Zehnder, S. Virden, J. & B. Hart, Ratliff Grocery Company, Wm. Clancy, Joe Ascher, Thos. P. Barr, H. M. Kernaghan, D. W. Wilkinson & Co., D. G. Pattin, E. Virden, T. J. Mitchell, Jr., merchants.

Canton, Miss.: C. L. Gross, Jones & Bros., D. & L. K. Levy, W. K. Baldwin, P. Trolio, A. Hiller, Isador Gross, S. Pulinsky, H. Gwinner, Luckett & Hall, C. Wohnner, and I. Hesdorffer, merchants.

Macon, Miss.: A. Klaus, J. W. Klaus, J. L. Klaus, Z. T. Dorrah, Jno. W. Carr, E. V. Yates, Jas. C. Bush, R. B. Wovory, R. Breider, J. L. Cruce, J. W. Patty, F. M. Chapman, Chas. Hardin, J. L. Griggs, T. S. Murphey, E. C. Batchelor, C. C. Sessions, Louis Frank, T. E. Woodward, J. S. Scott, N. H. Harrison, T. N. Cole, Benj. Klaus, S. J. Feibleman, J. Holliery, F. E. Carleton, H. L. Owens, Wm. H. Helm, W. B. Stewart, W. N. Jones, Jno. D. Dolhew, Sam. Hamerstein, D. Owens, C. L. Heinrich, Wm. White, W. S. Frunur, J. C. Cavett, L. F. Holberg, Jno. A. Tyson, Macon Mercantile Company, N. Scales, D. W. Smoot, W. H. Scales, J. P. Triplett, T. P. Crymer, W. P. Calmes, R. Kedolting, Jr., W. E. Stokes, C. B. Ames, G. L. Conner, J. L. Holberg, W. F. Skinner, J. R. Craig, J. F. Jones, D. W. Dent, W. S. Farmer, W. O. Barnes, J. E. Rives, S. P. Fant, Jno. Chappell, D. B. Scarborough, R. C. Hamerstein, W. J. Phelps, R. Hamerstein, J. J. Hamerstein, W. H. Helm, Threefoot Bros. & Co., Winner & Meyer, Sam. Lyle, and Jos. Baum & Son Company, merchants.

Crystal Springs, Miss.: Lotterhos & Huber, T. D. Nicolson, J. C. Smith, W. C. Wilkinson, W. H. Barron & Co., O. H. Spence, and A. Oulif, merchants.

Meridian, Miss.: I. Klein and R. H. Suttle, merchants.

Edwards, Miss.: L. A. Moss, G. F. Walblinger, B. B. Ballard, J. L. Redfield, Wm. Price & Co., A. J. Lewis, L. D. Freese, J. J. Gold, J. B. Howie, F. Angelo, W. G. Redfield, M. W. P. Pool, Jno. D. Butler, S. J. Birdsong, J. D. White, Jas. D. Hagan, R. H. Nollin, J. K. Robb, Jno. E. P. Pool, W. O. Dromgooe, D. V. Howell, A. McCallum, and E. F. Crisler, merchants.

Yazoo City, Miss.: J. F. Powell, Hollingsworth Bros., D. J. Dunn, F. Howard, Warren & Montgomery Bros., R. Hirsch & Co., Alex. Deck, F. Barksdale, T. A. Brown & Co., Brown & Troy, J. H. Barnwell, D. A. Swayze & Co., E. Summerfield, Jno. J. North & Co., W. H. Hyatt, A. H. Courts, W. H. Richardson, H. S. O'Reilly, M. W. Purnell, D. A. James & Co., E. G. Olden & Co., F. Schmitt, and Wise Bros., merchants.

Vicksburg, Miss.: R. L. Crook & Co., S. C. Ragan & Co., S. Schwarz & Co., L. M. Nicholson & Co., P. P. Williams Company, Emile Bonnell, and Sherard Grocery Company, merchants.

Greenwood, Miss.: W. W. McNeill, J. B. Redditt, Robt. Herman, Hendeson Baird, Joe Stein, Austin & Fountain, Harron, R. T. Jones & Co., Jno. Dalmier & Son, Thayer & Co., L. T. Baskett, H. Bernstein, W. L. Barrow, A. Casper, H. Lenoir, Saul J. Stein, E. Hyman & Bro., Stein Bros., and R. P. Greene, merchants.

Fayette, Miss.: B. Straas, N. Eilbott, C. Cooper, G. C. Fleming, McClure & Harper, S. Hirsch & Co., R. R. Liddell, Mrs. W. L. Stephen, J. J. Gordon, F. Krauss, H. H. Meyer, and J. J. Liden, merchants.

Utica, Miss.: Z. Wardlow, S. Grossman & Co., D. T. Lee, Smith & Winters, M. F. Powell, Long & Osborne, E. H. Currie & Bro., Lattimore & Harris, Reeves & Maddox, Mimms P. Newman, and Kelley & Carson, merchants.

Magnolia, Miss.: The Lampton Mercantile Company, V. A. Daniel, N. K. Nettles, D. M. Huff, J. E. Wolfe, S. Cohn & Son, Magnolia Mercantile Company, Williams & Elliott, T. C. Simons & Co., and H. Hall, merchants.

Tyler Town, Miss.: Lampton Bros. & Co., merchants.

Monticello, Miss.: Lampton Bros. & Rawls Company, Wm. Atkinson & Foxworth Company (Columbia, Miss.), and Wm. Atkinson & Baetot Company (Osyka, Miss.), merchants.

Brookhaven, Miss.: Jno. McGrath & Sons, A. C. Seavey, C. Heuck & Son, R. Abrahams, Hymen Zwirn, L. Cohen & Bro., Brookhaven Grocery Company, Pfeifer & Dreyfus, Jos. Heuck, Sherman & Davis, R. T. Scherck, L. Lewenthal & Son, J. M. Wood, Max. Priebatsch, Daniel & Willoughby, and Geo. Bowsky, merchants.

Wesson, Miss.: The Becker, Lyell & McGrath Company, Bank of Wesson, S. P. Bloom, Wm. Atkinson & McDonald, W. L. Welman, J. P. Remleuf, H. E. Price, Earns, Long & Co., Williams Bros., and J. F. Patterson, merchants.

Durant, Miss.: Joe A. Rosenberg, Durant Commercial Company, Wm. Schild, Commercial Hotel, A. Schild, Joel Schild, C. H. Gaskins, Mullen & Owen, M. L. Weems, E. W. McLellan, W. E. McLellan & Bro., W. W. Barth, and J. Marseilles, merchants.

Holly Springs, Miss.: P. H. Fant and Jno. E. Anderson, merchants.

Camden, Ark.: Geo. L. Ritchie, Thomas D. Thomson, and M. G. Williams, wholesale grocers.

Eldorado, Ark.: E. C. Wilson & Co., merchants.

Mr. VEST. Now I move, if I have not already done so, to strike out paragraph 283, on page 82, for the purpose of putting salt upon the free list; and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by any lengthy argument at this time on this question; but it does seem to me that it is one that is entitled to serious consideration at the hands of the Senate.

The amount of the domestic production of salt in this country is more than a million and a half of tons, and the total importations are only a little over 200,000 tons. Since salt was put on the free list, in 1891, there have been large amounts of capital invested in salt manufacturing. People who have been familiar with the business from their childhood, people who have been engaged in salt manufacturing for years, are investing large sums of money now in New York and in Michigan in building new salt works.

The American production has enormously increased since salt was put on the free list. The American salt makers have the markets of this country absolutely in all the North. The cost of delivering a sack of Liverpool salt in New York is about 82 cents. The New Yorkers can sell the same kind of salt for about 72 cents in New York, as claimed by the trade. The expense of bringing salt from abroad is, of course, considerable, and, taking that into consideration, it gives all the protection that the American salt producers ought to ask. Then, when you take into consideration the fact that the great bulk of the consumption of salt, estimated at 70,000,000 bushels, is in the great interior, the enormous advantage is in favor of the American producers in all the interior points over what they have on the seaboard.

There is but one section of this country where this is not the case. The English salt makers can lay their salt down cheaper in the Southern States than can the Northern salt makers, because the expense of transporting it from the Northern salt works to the Southern States is larger in proportion than the ocean transportation from England to the South. Of the 220,000 tons of salt imported into this country, more than 120,000 are imported into the South.

The effect of the adoption of this paragraph will be simply to increase the cost of the salt consumed by the Southern people. It will not bring salt into the Northern States, because the manufacturers of salt in that section of the country absolutely control the market now.

I have here statements made by salt manufacturers, which show the cost in detail of manufacturing and delivering salt at important commercial centers all through the country, showing that American salt can be made and laid down cheaper than it can be brought from abroad. There is absolutely no room for competition in the Northern market; it is a matter of no concern whatever, and the salt makers themselves would not have asked for the imposition of this tax to affect the salt in the Northern States. It is simply for the purpose of compelling the people who are already having a hard enough time in the Southern States to pay an increased price for salt that this tax was put upon it, as I believe.

Mr. President, the hour is late, and while this is a wonderfully interesting subject, and one which ought to attract the attention of all Senators, I shall not detain the Senate now by going elaborately into this question; but I wish to call the attention of Senators to the importations of salt.

In 1884 there were imported into this country 416,000 tons; in 1885, 370,000 tons; in 1886, 365,000 tons. The importation steadily decreased, year by year, down to 1894, when it came to 154,000 tons. In 1895, after salt had gone on the free list, there was an increase in the importation, and it went from 154,000 tons to 221,000 tons, and in 1896 it reached 246,000 tons. At the same time there was an increase in the domestic production of salt, while salt was free, of 231,000 tons; showing that the increase is enormously more rapid in the development of the domestic production than it is in the importation of foreign salt.

The statement is made in these papers that salt is delivered free on board cars at a dollar and a half a ton. The freight cost, as stated by the merchants, has been in no instance less than 6 shillings, and in almost every instance 6 shillings and 6 pence, making \$1.62, the freight across the ocean thus amounting to more than the price of the salt, American made, delivered on board the cars. There is 100 per cent protection in the transportation alone across the ocean, which seems to me in all conscience to be enough.

Every human being, every domestic animal, every man, woman, and child, is compelled to use salt. It is an article of universal use; it goes into every home and is used at every meal. It is used for all domestic purposes.

Why we should now undertake to increase the cost of this article, an absolute necessary of life, when the natural conditions existing give the producers of it a protection of more than 100 per cent is beyond my comprehension, unless we stop to think that it seems to be the policy of the Republican party, wherever and whenever they see the possibility of levying a tax on the many for the benefit of the few, that they will avail themselves of every such opportunity. While it is the case now in this country that foreign salt can not interfere with the American production, except in the Southern States, there seems to be a desire to seize every opportunity to levy a species of blackmail on those who eat their bread in the sweat of their faces all the days of their lives in the Southern States, for the purpose of increasing the price to be paid to certain salt manufacturers of this country, when, after all, Mr. President, the result is no benefit to the salt producer. The transportation companies intervene between the two; and we

know how adept they are in turning whatever advantages the conditions may offer to their own use and profit.

I think that in the whole compass of this bill there is not a single provision which is more absolutely indefensible than this one of the tax on salt.

I should be glad to have the Senate consider some of the numerous arguments, some of the reasons and illustrations, which are as thick as blackberries in their season, why salt should remain on the free list; but I shall not trespass on the time or the patience of the Senate at this late hour to present them. I shall only repeat that I have letters on my desk from American salt manufacturers themselves, men who have put their money in Michigan salt works and in New York salt works, and who are handling salt by the ton, who say they have invested their money in the production of salt under free salt, and they state distinctly and clearly that they want no tax on salt; that they are perfectly satisfied that they can hold their own against anybody anywhere, and that this market can not be influenced by any outside importation; that it cuts no figure whatever.

Mr. President, the majority of the committee think that salt should be given free to packers of fish on the Atlantic Seaboard. What is the reason why packers of fish should have salt free any more than packers of beef? Why should the packers of fish have salt free any more than the men who want to use it for food? There is no reason for it that I can see except that that section of the country and its representatives are vigilant and active in looking after their local interests, and they have been in the habit in all tariff bills as they have been passed of making discriminations against the balance of the country and in favor of certain sections under their own particular care.

I sincerely hope that the patriotism of the Senate will be sufficient to prevent the perpetration of this great wrong by putting so monstrous a proposition as this upon the statute books, when it is clear that it can have but one effect, and that is to tax again an already overtaxed and overburdened people in one locality in this country. I demand the yeas and nays on this proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to strike out paragraph 283.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. KENNEY (when the name of Mr. HARRIS of Kansas was called). I was requested by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. MCLAURIN (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). I was requested by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to announce his pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THURSTON. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY. Except for the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], I should vote "yea" on this proposition.

Mr. BURROWS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CLARK], who is unavoidably absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. SEWELL (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. SEWELL. I withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bacon,
Bate,
Berry,
Chilton,
Clay,
Cockrell,

Faulkner,
Gray,
Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Kenney,
McLaurin,

Mallory,
Mills,
Morgan,
Pasco,
Pettigrew,
Pettus,

Roach,
Turner,
Turpie,
Vest,
Walthall,
White.

NAYS—31.

Allison,
Burrows,
Carter,

Chandler,
Cullom,
Davis,

Deboe,
Elkins,
Fairbanks,

Foraker,
Frye,
Gallinger,

Gear,
Nawley,
Hoar,
McBride,
McEnery,

Mason,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Platt, Conn.

Quay,
Pritchard,
Proctor,
Shoup,
Spoonor,

Thurston,
Warren,
Wetmore,
Wilson.

NOT VOTING—34.

Aldrich,
Allen,
Baker,
Butler,
Caffery,
Cannon,
Clark,
Daniel,
George,

Gorman,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Harris, Kans.
Harris, Tenn.
Jones, Nev.
Kyle,
Lindsay,

Lodge,
McMillan,
Mantle,
Martin,
Mitchell,
Morrill,
Murphy,
Platt, N. Y.
Rawlins,

Sewell,
Smith,
Stewart,
Teller,
Tillman,
Wellington,
Wolcott.

So Mr. VEST's amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 83, paragraph 284, line 2, before the word "cents," to strike out "two" and insert "one and one-half;" so as to make the paragraph read:

284. Starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, fit for use as starch, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. WHITE. I have received a letter on this subject. I am not personally aware of the technical matters referred to in the communication, but I will read it, so that if it affords any information to the committee it may be acted upon:

MILTON, MASS., May 12, 1897.

DEAR SIR: We notice that by section 284 of the tariff bill as reported to the Senate, a duty of 1½ cents per pound is levied on starch, and that by section 285 a like duty is levied upon "dextrine, burnt starch, gum substitute, or British gum."

We wish to call your attention to the illogical nature of these duties as compared with each other.

Starch is the raw material of dextrine and of British gums, and is the only material which in any way affects their weight. In the course of manufacture the raw starch is first treated with chemicals, which do not in the slightest degree add to its weight, and it is then subjected for a considerable length of time to an intense heat, which converts it either into dextrine or British gum, according to the nature of the chemicals applied.

The inevitable result of this process is a shrinkage of from 15 to 22 per cent, so that it takes much more than 1 pound of starch to make 1 pound of dextrine, or British gum. Therefore, while we receive protection to the amount of 1½ cents per pound on our manufactured product, we pay a duty of about 2 cents per pound on the raw material which enters into that pound of manufactured product, making an actual discrimination against the domestic manufacturer of about one-half cent per pound.

This, we submit, is an injustice and hardship to which we should not be subjected. The result of this system of duties is typically illustrated in the potato-dextrine trade. The discrimination against the American manufacturers turns over to the German manufacturers practically the whole of a large business which, with a logical tariff, we believe that the American manufacturers would entirely control.

We feel that the change which we ask is a matter of simple justice, and trust that we may rely upon your assistance in having a duty levied upon dextrine, burnt starch, gum substitute, or British gums one-half cent per pound higher than upon starch; in other words, if the duty on starch remains at 1½ cents per pound, the duty on dextrine and British gums should be 2 cents per pound.

Respectfully, yours,

HORATIO N. GLOVER & SON.

Hon. STEPHEN M. WHITE.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The letter is signed by Horatio N. Glover & Son, manufacturers of dextrine, British gums, gum substitute, Milton, Mass.

I called the attention of the author of this letter to the fact that the same discrimination obtained in previous laws, and he said that was undoubtedly the fact, but nevertheless the statement he made is absolutely accurate. I suggest whether, under this showing, if the statement be correct, and I believe it is from a respectable firm, the duties ought to remain as they are. True, it has been so heretofore, but that would scarcely afford an argument.

Mr. ALLISON. I call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that under the act of 1890 the duty on starch is 2 cents and on burnt starch 1½ cents.

Mr. WHITE. That is obviously wrong.

Mr. ALLISON. It would seem to be obviously wrong. Yet there was no special complaint about it, because in the act of 1894 the only correction made was to put the two on an equality. It may be that what this gentleman states is true. It evidently must cost something to burn the starch.

Mr. WHITE. It will be observed that in the statement which I just read the writer mentions one large line of manufacturing which is being conducted wholly abroad now because of a discrimination of that kind. It seems to me that if we can we ought to rectify it. However, I do not make any motion. I merely attract the attention of the Senator to the subject. Perhaps when the bill reaches the Senate an amendment might be drawn.

Mr. ALLISON. Would the Senator suggest a higher duty on dextrine?

Mr. WHITE. I would suggest a lower duty on starch, to equalize it in that way.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Senator might find difficulty on our side of the Chamber, and probably on his, in attempting to reduce the duty on starch.

Mr. WHITE. If I were pursuing the theory of the Senator from Iowa, I should raise it on the second section.

Mr. FRYE. That is what the Senator from Iowa ought to do.

Mr. WHITE. I will allow it to remain as it is.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; and we will see about it later.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 83, line 3, paragraph 285, before the word "cents," to strike out "two" and insert "one and one-half;" so as to make the paragraph read:

285. Dextrine, burnt starch, gum substitute, or British gum, $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 286, line 8, after the word "pound," to strike out—

Sweet marjoram, 3 cents per pound; summer savory, coriander seed, and thyme, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

So as to make the paragraph read:

286. Spices: Mustard, ground or prepared, in bottles or otherwise, 10 cents per pound; capsicum or red pepper, or cayenne pepper, $\frac{2}{3}$ cents per pound; sage, 1 cent per pound; spices not specially provided for in this act, 3 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 12, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

286 $\frac{1}{2}$. Tea, 10 cents per pound, until January 1, 1900; after that date tea shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the paragraph may be passed over. It will be observed that it is only a temporary duty, intended to bridge over a deficiency that may occur for the first year or two. I hope that during the progress of the bill we may dispense with this duty. I am not quite prepared to suggest it, however, so I ask that the paragraph may be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish, for the information of the Senate, to call attention to a few remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] during 1894, in reference to this very matter. In criticising the Democratic side he made use of this phraseology:

If it be the purpose of this amendment to raise revenue, if it is a necessity, as I claim it is not—

Referring to sugar—

to raise additional revenue, why not take some other means? There are a thousand methods open to the Congress which are certainly preferable to this one. Why not impose a higher duty upon whisky if revenue is a necessity? Why not increase the tax upon beer? The tax of \$1.50 a barrel upon beer would give approximately as much revenue as the proposed duty upon sugar. Who would be hurt by the imposition of a tax like that? Not all the people of the United States, because they are not obliged to buy beer.

I showed in some statements which I made to the Senate a week or ten days ago that the absolute reductions in taxes by this bill as it now stands upon pure luxuries is \$38,000,000, or an approximate sum to that which is proposed to be imposed by the bill upon sugar. Think of the monstrous proposition of reducing the duties upon cosmetics, upon artificial feathers and flowers, upon fine laces and embroideries, upon silk clothing, and upon all that class of articles, in order to furnish an excuse for the imposition of a tax upon sugar! What justification can you find in the judgment of the American people for this action?

I refer to an extract in the same connection and bearing directly upon the tea tax.

Again—

He says—

If it is necessary to secure revenue, as I believe it is not, why not add to the tax on tobacco? You can easily get from an additional tax on tobacco all the revenue which it is proposed to derive from the tax on sugar. Why not, if revenue is necessary and you do not care to levy a tax upon anything produced in the United States, impose a duty on tea and coffee? A duty of 10 cents a pound on tea would never reach the consumer of tea through an addition to price, as tea which can be imported to-day at from 10 to 12 cents a pound is sold at retail mainly at from 40 to 50 cents a pound.

You might impose a duty upon tea of 10 cents a pound and it would reduce the profits of the importers or of the distributors of tea in the United States; but when you impose a duty upon sugar, so close is the competition upon sugar that whatever you add to the duty, as shown so clearly by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Peffer] yesterday, is certainly and inevitably added to the price to the consumer, wherever he may be located. There is no dispute whatever about this proposition, and there can be none.

Thinking that possibly the proposition might be overlooked by Senators upon the other side, I call attention to the suggestion thus made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, that it was unnecessary to tax sugar, that a tax upon tea and beer would answer the purposes much better.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, paragraph 286 $\frac{1}{2}$ will be passed over. The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 287, line 16, before the word "gallon," to insert the word "proof;" and in line 17, after the word "standard," to insert "proof;" so as to make the paragraph read:

287. Vinegar, $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per proof gallon. The standard proof for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce troy of vinegar.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not press the consideration of the bill further to-night.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to ask unanimous consent to go back to the first paragraph of the bill in order to offer an amendment in

the morning, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD. I was not present when that part of the bill was acted upon; it was not possible for me to be here; and I have an amendment which I wish to offer, and I should like to have it voted on in the morning. It relates to the first paragraph of the bill. I will send the amendment to the desk in order that it may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "prescribed," in line 9, page 1, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That only 75 per cent of the duties imposed by this act shall be collected on imports from countries whose mints are open to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the rate of 16 grains of fine silver equal in value to 1 grain of fine gold.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent that we may go back to that part of the bill in the morning, in order that we may have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut and others. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLISON. I trust the Senator from Texas will not press that request at this moment. The amendment may lead to some debate. I think very likely it will. There are very many things which have already been passed over, and it is not wise to discuss the amendment the Senator from Texas has offered.

Mr. MILLS. I will ask to have the amendment printed in the RECORD as one which I shall offer to the bill at the proper time.

Mr. ALLISON. To that I have no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment has been read, and it will therefore appear in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 17, 1897, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 16, 1897.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Stewart L. Woodford, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain, vice Hannis Taylor, resigned.

CONSUL.

Julius Goldschmidt, of Wisconsin, to be consul-general of the United States at Berlin, Germany, vice Charles de Kay, resigned.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John R. Puryear, of Kentucky, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Paducah, in the State of Kentucky, to succeed Felix G. Rudolph, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Levi M. Willcutts, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for the district of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, in place of Emil Olund, removed.

AUDITOR FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Frank H. Morris, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the Navy Department, to succeed William H. Pugh, resigned.

ASSISTANT AGENT AT SALMON FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

James C. Boatman, of California, to be assistant agent at the salmon fisheries of Alaska, office created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 4, 1897.

AGENT AT SALMON FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

Howard M. Kutchin, of California, to be agent at the salmon fisheries of Alaska, office created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 4, 1897.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

General officer.

Col. Anson Mills, Third Cavalry, to be brigadier-general, June 16, 1897, vice Mizner, retired from active service.

Quartermaster's Department.

First Lieut. Andrew Gregg Curtin Quay, Third Cavalry, to be assistant quartermaster, with the rank of captain, June 16, 1897, vice Pope, nominated for promotion.

Maj. John Simpson, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, June 11, 1897, vice Forsyth, retired from active service.

Capt. James Worden Pope, assistant quartermaster, to be quartermaster, with the rank of major, June 11, 1897, vice Simpson, promoted.

Cavalry arm.

First Lieut. Thomas Jefferson Lewis, Second Cavalry, to be captain, June 13, 1897, vice Kingsbury, Second Cavalry, deceased.

Second Lieut. William Franklin Clark, Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, June 13, 1897, vice Lewis, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Artillery arm.

Capt. James Chester, Third Artillery, to be major, June 7, 1897, vice Darling, Third Artillery, retired from active service.

First Lieut. John Deane Charles Hoskins, Third Artillery, to be captain, June 7, 1897, vice Chester, Third Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Archibald Campbell, Third Artillery, to be first lieutenant, June 7, 1897, vice Hoskins, Third Artillery, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 16, 1897.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frank G. Deckabach, of Ocosta, Wash., to be register of the land office at Olympia, Wash.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John O'B. Scobey, of Olympia, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at Olympia, Wash.

POSTMASTERS.

Cassius C. Pillsbury, to be postmaster at West Superior, in the county of Douglas and State of Wisconsin.

Reuben J. Mott, to be postmaster at Port Allegany, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania.

George H. Swearingen, to be postmaster at Dunbar, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 17, 1897.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. HUGH JOHNSTON, D. D., of the city of Washington.

Mr. HENRY M. TELLER, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat to-day.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Joseph Dobbins and 86 other citizens of Worcester, Mass., employed in the carpet mills of M. J. W. Whithall, praying for the early enactment of a protective-tariff law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the proposed duty of \$2 per thousand feet upon lumber; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against any increase in the present rate of duty on India tanned skins for morocco; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Young Men's Christian Association of Somerville, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the reproduction of prize fights by means of the kinetoscope; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., and a petition of 103 citizens of Lake Crystal, Minn., praying for the early passage of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of 49 citizens of Rochester, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of a clause in the pending tariff bill providing for the use of stamps on bank checks; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rifton Glen, N. Y., praying for the early enactment of a protective-tariff law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry memorials of citizens of New York City, remonstrating against the proposed increase of the tax on beer; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MORRILL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Randolph, Vt., praying for the earliest possible passage of a protective-tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Millers' National Association of the United States, praying for the adoption of a reciprocity clause in the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Rohlfing Sons' Music Company and other importers of musical merchandise of Milwaukee, Wis., praying that the customs duty on musical instruments and parts for the same be provided for at the rate of 35 per cent ad valorem; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Krause Shoe Company, of Milwaukee; of the Racine Shoe Company, of Racine, and of the Atwell Shoe Company, of Milwaukee, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against an import duty on raw goatskins; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Laconia Lumber Works, of Laconia, N. H., and a memorial of W. P. Gardner & Co., of Concord, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed duty of \$2 per thousand feet on lumber; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Woodbury Bros., of New Hampshire, remonstrating against an increase in the present rate of duty on tanned skins for morocco or a duty on raw goatskins; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of W. D. Brackett & Co., of Boston, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on goatskins; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VEST presented memorials of the Amalgamated Wood Workers, the Building and Trade Council, the Union of United Brewers' Workmen's Association, and sundry other organizations of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAFFERY presented a memorial of E. J. Hart & Co. and 1,004 other citizens of Louisiana, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of J. O. Perrin and sundry other citizens of Lafayette, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission as proposed by the Indianapolis (Ind.) monetary convention; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the early enactment of a protective-tariff law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MORGAN presented sundry memorials of citizens of Birmingham, Ala., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation intended to destroy the present system of ticket brokerage; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KYLE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Custer and Goodwin, in the State of South Dakota, and a petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the early enactment of a protective-tariff law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Raleigh, N. C., praying for the early passage of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Thomas J. Keith, of Charlotte, N. C., praying that he be remunerated for services as night watchman at the post-office at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of C. J. Hibbard, of Newport, Vt., remonstrating against an increase in the present rate of duty on tanned skins for morocco, or a duty on raw goatskins; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THURSTON, from the Select Committee on International Expositions, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 32) accepting the invitation of the French Republic to take part in an international exposition to be held in Paris in 1900 A. D., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1133) to pay the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works its claim for damages and losses incurred in the construction of the armored battle ship *Texas*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2041) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, striking out "twenty-eight consecutive hours" and "twenty-eight hours" and inserting "forty consecutive hours" and "forty hours," reported it without amendment.

LANDS IN GREER COUNTY, OKLA.

Mr. CARTER. Upon the 19th of May the Secretary of the Interior addressed a communication to Congress requesting that the time within which certain homestead settlers in Greer County, Okla., should have the preference right to file on lands be extended for the period of six months. The extension was sought because the land office could not be opened before the 1st day of July, whereas under the existing law the preference right would expire on the 18th day of that month. The intervening time, that is, the space of time between the opening of the land office and the expiration of the preference right under the law, is not adequate to enable all of the settlers to make their filings. The Committee on Public Lands unanimously report a bill granting the extension as requested, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall not object unless it leads to debate. If it does, of course I must insist on the regular order.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will not lead to debate.